With the Respects of the Author.

3

EXAMINATION

OF

A TRACT

ON

THE ALTERATION OF THE TARIFF,

WRITTEN BY THOMAS COOPER, M. D.

BY A PENNSYLVANIAN.

TO WHICH IS ANNEXED,

THE TRACT OF JUDGE COOPER,

VERBATIM.

PHILADELPHIA:
PRINTED FOR H. C. CAREY & I. LEA.

1824.

PREFACE.

THE immense importance of the protection of so large a portion of the industry of the country, as is employed in manufactures, warrants and requires an extraordinary degree of attention to the subject.

Fortunately Judge Cooper's pamphlet has afforded a favourable opportunity of a complete discussion of it. He has collected together in one solid mass very nearly all the arguments which have been adduced by the school of politicians who are hostile to any change in our present system,—a system whose operation has blighted the bounties of nature, paralized the industry of our citizens, and inflicted bankruptcy on hundreds of them, and distress and suffering on thousands.

If the Judge has failed of making out his case, it is not for want of talents or industry. In regard to both, he stands on high ground. The failure results solely from the intrinsic unsoundness of the cause he has undertaken to defend. The utmost that splendid talents can accomplish in this case, is to give such a plausible appearance to the arguments, as may satisfy a superficial reader. But when they are duly investigated, they will eternally "be "found wanting."

The facts of the case are wholly against the writers of this school. They cannot adduce a single instance, in which a nation has prospered, that has allowed foreigners to trample down its industry as we do. History, in its widest range, may be ransacked for the purpose in vain. It is replete with the most unerring admonitions on the subject. On what other rock have nations, the most highly favoured by nature, which have for centuries exhibited the most melancholy examples of wretchedness, shipwrecked their prosperity—their "wealth, power, and "resources?" To what other source can we trace the

degraded and enfeebled state of Spain? of Portugal? of Poland? of Italy? of Ireland?

On the other hand, the dawn of the greatness of the most prosperous nations of the world has been coeval with the effectual protection of their manufactures. England, France, and Prussia, afford strong and striking examples in full proof.

The case of Russia, as stated by the emperor himself, which may be seen in page 2 of the Examination, if it stood alone, would decide this question forever. It is recommended to the reader's most serious consideration.

How such powerful facts can be overlooked, is inexplicable.

Except Holland, which is in a state of extreme depression, there is no nation in Europe, which does not protect its industry by prohibitions of, or prohibitory duties on, those articles which it can produce, in sufficient quantities to supply its wants. And except Holland, there is no country in the civilized world, in which the manufacturers are in so unprotected a state as in the United States.

The wise system of protection is adopted, to a greater or less extent, by all the new republics of this hemisphere. The Tariff of Peru states distinctly—

"*All manufactures which directly prejudice the industry of the* "*country—such as ready-made clothes, white and coloured leather,* "*boots, shoes, chairs, sofas, tables, commodes, coaches, calashes, sad-* "*dles, and other manufactures of harness, ironmongery, wax, sper-* "*maceti and tallow candles, and powder,* SHALL PAY DOUBLE THE DU- "TIES ESTABLISHED IN THE 6th, 8th, AND 9th ARTICLES."

Our policy is, therefore, diametrically opposite to that of nearly the whole civilized world. Both systems cannot be right. One must be radically unsound. Either the other nations must be blind to their true interest, and we alone wise—or we are blind and they wise. Who can be found so extravagant as to suppose that our statesmen are wiser, and better understand the art of promoting national welfare and prosperity, than Sully, Colbert, Edward IV. Henry IV. and the rulers of all the prosperous nations of Europe, of whose policy ours is the antipodes? The general depression of the country, notwithstanding its transcendent advantages,

compared with the prosperity of Great Britain and France, labouring under immense disadvantages, affords a solution of the important problem—which policy is the sound one?

Independent of the practice of the European nations, the policy of protecting the national manufactures, has the sanction of the powerful names of Franklin, Jefferson, and Hamilton, who urge it in the most unequivocal manner. To congress, entrusted with the high responsibility of promoting the general welfare—it ought to be pronounced in tones of thunder—*utrum horum mavis*—Judge Cooper, or Colbert, Sully, Edward IV. Henry IV. Franklin, Jefferson, and Hamilton? It would be insanity to hesitate in the choice of a school of political economy, when such are the professors on either side.

"The *restrictive regulations*, which, in foreign markets, *abridge* "*the vent for the increasing surplus of our agricultural products*, "serve to beget a desire that *a more extensive demand for that sur-* "*plus be created at home.*

"To secure such a market, *there is no other expedient than to pro-* "*mote manufacturing establishments.* Manufacturers, who constitute "the most numerous class after the cultivators of the land, are, for "that reason, *the principal consumers of the surplus of their labour.*

"This idea of an extensive domestic market for the surplus pro- "duce of the soil, *is of the first consequence. It is, of all things, that* "*which most effectually conduces to a flourishing state of agricul-* "*ture.*"[1]

"The *uniform appearance of an abundance of specie, as the con-* "*comitant of a flourishing state of manufactures,* and of the reverse, "where they do not prevail, afford a strong presumption of their fa- "vourable operation upon the wealth of a country."[1]

"Considering a monopoly of the domestic market to its own manu- "factures as the reigning policy of manufacturing nations, *a similar* "*policy, on the part of the United States,* in every proper instance, "is dictated, it might almost be said *by the principles of distributive* "*justice—certainly by the duty of securing to their own citizens a* "*reciprocity of advantages.*"[1]

Thus far Hamilton. Let us hear the venerable Franklin—

"Foreign luxuries, and needless manufactures, imported and used "in a nation, *increase the people of the nation that furnishes them,* "and *diminish the people of the nation that uses them.*"[2]

"Laws, therefore, that prevent such importations, and, on the con- "trary, promote the exportation of manufactures to be consumed in "foreign countries, may be called, (with respect to the people that

[1] Hamilton's Works, Vol. I. [2] Franklin, iv. p. 189.

"make them,) *generative laws, as, by increasing subsistence, they* "*encourage marriage.*"[3]

"Such laws, likewise, strengthen a nation doubly, *by increasing* "*its own people*, and diminishing its neighbours."[4]

With those two statesmen, coincide the sentiments of Jefferson:—

"Where a nation imposes high duties on our productions, *or pro-* "*hibits them altogether, it may be proper for us to do the same by* "*theirs—first burdening or excluding those productions which they* "*bring here in competition with our own of the same kind; selecting* "*next, such manufactures as we take from them in greatest quantity,* "*and which at the same time we could the soonest furnish to ourselves,* "or obtain from other countries; imposing on them duties light at "first, but heavier and heavier afterwards, as other channels of sup-"ply open.

"Such duties, having the effect of indirect encouragement to do-"mestic manufactures of the same kind, *may induce the manufac-* "*turer to come himself into these states*, where cheaper subsistence, "equal laws, and a vent for his wares, free of duty, may insure him "the highest profits from his skill and industry. *The oppressions of* "*our agriculture in foreign parts would thus be made the occasion* "*of relieving it from a dependence on the councils and conduct of* "*others, and of promoting arts, manufactures, and population at* "*home.*"[5]

"To be independent for the comforts of life, we must fabricate "them ourselves. *We must now place the manufacturer by the side* "*of the agriculturist.*

"*Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as neces-* "*sary to our independence as to our comfort.*"[6]

To those great names I can add one of probably more weight with a large class of our citizens, namely Adam Smith, from whom the following excellent maxim is derived:

"*Whatever tends to diminish in any country the number of artifi-* "*cers and manufacturers, tends to diminish the home market, the* "*most important of all markets, for the rude produce of the land;* "*and thereby further to discourage agriculture.*"

That if the depression of manufactures "diminishes "the *domestic market for the rude produce of the soil*" their prosperity must increase that market, is too obvious to require illustration. It therefore clearly follows, as a corollary, that the protection of manufactures, must necessarily be eminently beneficial to the agri-

[3] Franklin, iv. p. 129. [4] Ibid.

[5] Jefferson's Report on the Privileges and Restrictions of the Commerce of the United States in Foreign Countries.

[6] Jefferson's Letter to Austin.

culturists, who comprise about three-fourths of the nation; and is, of consequence, the only sound policy.

Thus, against a system to which many of our citizens cling with as much devotion as the followers of Mahomet to the Koran, we have the experience and practice of nearly all the civilized world, the admonitory lessons of three of the greatest statesmen of whom this country can boast, with the concurring opinion of Adam Smith. Surely those men must be possessed of supereminent powers, whose opinions are to outweigh all this concurring testimony. If we may have many such men in our councils, we must be more singularly fortunate than any other nation ever was.

From the great interest felt on this subject, I have been led to adopt a plan rarely if ever before essayed. In order to enable those who sincerely seek after truth, to form an accurate decision, I have annexed to the Examination, Judge Cooper's Tract, printed verbatim, and nearly page for page. Still further to facilitate their enquiries, I have printed in Italics all the passages commented on, and have referred to the pages of the Examination in which the comments are to be found. Thus the subject is placed fully and completely before the nation.

A PENNSYLVANIAN.

Philadelphia, Jan. 28, 1824.

Philadelphia, Jan. 30, 1824.

P. S. Judge Cooper, in page 13 of his Tract, authoritatively gives the world to understand that there is no good iron or steel manufactured in America.

In page 36 of the Examination, I have given some testimonials to rebut this assertion. I have just received a document on the subject, which will add to the proofs already afforded, how unsafe a guide this gentleman is in political economy, whatever may be his merits as a chemist.

CERTIFICATE.

"I, the subscriber, Cutler and Surgical Instrument Maker, "in the city of New York, do hereby certify, that I have "worked two samples of New Brunswick Patent Steel, manu- "factured by S. Seymour & Co.; one made of the native "Bloomery Iron, of Morris county, New Jersey, the other "made of Swedish Iron: that out of the first, I made some "penknife blades, and out of the latter a razor. That they "are of a quality superior to any of the English Blistered "Steel. That of the two samples, the former, in my opinion, "is best. And that for the purposes of making the coarser "kind of edged tools, such as axes, adzes, scythes, drawing "knives, chisels, plain bits, &c. either of them is but little "inferior to cast steel, as they will hold an edge as long. "And that the only objection to this steel for making the "finest edged instruments, arises from there being some im- "purities in the iron out of which it is made, from the want "of being first refined; which in very fine instruments show "themselves in small flaws, and mar their beauty more than "they injure their utility. Could this same steel, and par- "ticularly that made of native iron, be melted down and con- "verted into cast steel, so as to divest it of all impurities, I "doubt, whether the world could produce any thing superior "to it for the finest edged instruments which are made.

D. KLAUBERG."

Dated New York, Jan. 21, 1824.

P. S. *Erratum.* Throughout the numbers of the Examination, the caption is *Modification* of the Tariff. It ought to be *Alteration.*

Examination of Judge Cooper's "Tract on the Modification of the Tariff."

No. I.

JUDGE COOPER has once more appeared as a polemical writer against the modification of the tariff, and published a pamphlet, which is circulated with great industry, and hailed as a complete triumph by that school of political economists under whose banners he has arrayed himself.

When a man of considerable talents enters with zeal and ardour into a cause—studies it for a long time with care and attention—and avails himself of all the authors who have preceded him—if he does not make his case clear and conclusive to unprejudiced minds, it is fair to presume, that the cause must be intrinsically unsound.

That Judge Cooper possesses very considerable talents is a matter of public notoriety—that he has entered into this cause with great zeal and ardour, and put all his powers into requisition, the strong feeling manifest in every page of his work proves. He has three times, in three different years, addressed the public on this subject—and, according to his own account, studied Adam Smith, Say, Marcet, Craige, Mr. Cambreleng, and the North American Review. If therefore, I prove, as I hope to do, that he has fallen into numberless errors in point of fact—that most of his postulata are wholly inadmissible—and that some of his most important positions rest on the very slippery foundation of *ifs*—I hope the question may be considered as settled in the mind of every candid citizen. I shall enter on this examination without much regard to order, but shall be careful to quote his arguments fairly, in order to do him justice.

"Our legislators have the repentant example of Europe as "a beacon to direct their course." p. 3.

Here is an important assumption, wholly unwarranted by fact. No such *repentance* of restrictive duties exists. If the powers of Europe *repented* of the protection of native industry by prohibitory duties, they could change the system without difficulty. But I defy this gentleman in the face of the nation, to produce any proof of "repentance" on the subject of restriction—a single instance of any important relaxation in the tariffs of any one nation in Europe for ten years, except Russia and Holland, whose fatal examples must explode his theory forever in the minds of all those who prefer strong facts to mere speculations, however plausible. They hold out an awful beacon to our statesmen, to shun the rocks on

which the statesmen of Russia and Holland were so beguiled and bewildered as to shipwreck the national prosperity.

These cases deserve great detail—but I shall be very brief. Russia was prosperous in 1816, 17, 18, and 19; but, fascinated with the theories of Adam Smith and J. B. Say, she adopted a new tariff in 1820, on the delusive plan of letting trade regulate itself.—In this tariff she abrogated her prohibitions and lowered her duties. The country was immediately deluged with foreign goods, and, in due course, drained of its specie, as we have been in past years, to pay for the surplus of those imports, which far exceeded its exports. The most disastrous consequences took place. Circulation was stopped. Distress and wretchedness overspread the land. The manufacturers, as was the case in this country, first fell victims to this mistaken policy. Agriculture next felt the shock: and finally, bankruptcy swept away a large proportion of those commercial houses whose cupidity had paved the way for the misery of their country. A single gazette of France, of April, 1821, contained an account of seven bankruptcies of great commercial houses, which had recently taken place in Petersburgh and Moscow, four of which were for the enormous sum of 5,579,000 roubles. The amount of the remaining three was not stated. The Russian government was petrified with astonishment at the calamitous reverse that had taken place so unexpectedly. They hoped, but hoped in vain, that the evil was but temporary, and would soon work its cure; that trade would regulate itself; that specie would find its level; that "*the nations possessing the precious metals* "*in greater plenty,*" would be "*glad to sell them at* "*the increased price.*" Utter disappointment attended all these fond and delusive expectations. After two years of intense suffering, they were, as Judge Cooper justly observes, "*repentant*" for their transcendent folly. They retraced their steps, and have given the world "*a re-*"*pentant example,*" of which it is to be hoped our statesmen will not fail to avail themselves.

But I shall let the emperor speak for himself. His language on the subject is clear and unequivocal—

"In proportion as the prohibitory system is extended and "rendered perfect in other countries, *that state which pur-*"*sues the contrary system, makes from day to day sacrifices more* "*extensive and more considerable.* * * * * *It offers a continual en-*"*couragement to the manufactures of other countries—and its own* "*manufactures perish in the struggle which they are as yet un-*"*able to maintain.*

"It is with the most lively feelings of regret we acknowledge it is our own proper experience, which enables us to trace this picture. *The evils which it details have been realized in Russia and Poland since the conclusion of the act of the 7-19 of December*, 1818.[1] AGRICULTURE WITHOUT A MARKET, INDUSTRY WITHOUT PROTECTION, LANGUISH AND DECLINE. SPECIE IS EXPORTED, AND THE MOST SOLID COMMERCIAL HOUSES ARE SHAKEN. The public prosperity would soon feel the wound inflicted on private fortunes, if new regulations did not promptly change the actual state of affairs.

"*Events have proved that our* AGRICULTURE *and our* COMMERCE, *as well as our* MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY, *are not only paralized, but* BROUGHT TO THE BRINK OF RUIN."

This circular, signed by Count Nesselrode, was dated the 23d of March, 1822. The tariff, which accompanied it, contains prohibitions of above 300 articles,[2] of which some are genera, including various species.

To this strong and decisive fact, from which there can be no appeal, what reply will Judge Cooper, or the North American Review, or Mr. Cambreleng make? Their theory had a fair trial in Russia. It produced a copious harvest of ruin there, as it has uniformly done every where else. And this single fact ought to settle the question in the mind of every man who is not under the government of inveterate prejudice.

But the "*repentance*" of Europe, which makes such a grand display in Judge Cooper's pamphlet, and which is to admonish our statesmen, is not confined to Russia. Holland affords another pregnant example. In 1816, she enacted a new tariff, which reduced the duties very low, and abrogated all prohibitions. The country was immediately inundated with foreign manufactures—the specie was exported to pay for them—domestic manufactures were ruined—circulation was arrested—commerce decayed—agriculture was palsied—the capacity of the people to pay taxes was so far reduced that the revenue failed, to the amount of about $4,000,000 in 1820 and 1821.

Of the disastrous result of this tariff, I annex a sketch from a celebrated work, entitled—"Considerations sur le projet de loi, concernant le nouveau système financièr du royaume de Pays bas. A Bruxelles, 27 Juin, 1821."

[1] The tariff did not go into operation till 1820.

[2] This new tariff I send to Washington to Mr. Clay for the examination of our government.

"Our people are in the most unfortunate situation for "want of work; as it appears, from authentic documents, "submitted to the States general, that *one-ninth part of the "most industrious nation in the world, passionately devoted to "labour, is reduced to the abject state of mendicity*, or to solicit "aid to support their existence; that a still more numerous "part, the middle and working class, is circumscribed to the "consumption of mere necessaries; and that MANUFAC-"TURES and COMMERCE, being in a languishing condi-"tion, the profits of persons who follow those two branches "of industry, are insignificant."

"It is the tariff of 1816, which has opened the door to the "productions of foreign industry. *From that period there has "been a constant deficiency in our finances;* because the work-"ing classes, deprived of wages, have been obliged to dimi-"nish their consumption of the articles subject to the excise "and impost—and because the manufacturers, the merchants, "and the traders, deprived of the profit which they derived "from the disbursement of most part of those wages, have "likewise been obliged to diminish their consumption.

"It is since 1816, that the ninth part of the nation is re-"duced either to mendicity, or to require assistance [for support.]

"It is since 1816, that manufactures and commerce have "declined with giant strides:

"It is since 1816, that the metallic medium of the nation "has been lavished to pay tribute to foreign industry.

"This disappearance of the specie is most perniciously felt "by the reduction of the price of houses, which, except in "Brussels and the Hague, *have fallen, since that period, "more than one-third;* an irrefragable proof of the impove-"rishment of the nation; for if our resources were the same "as formerly, houses would still command the same price."

"Since the tariff of 1816 has permitted the entry of Scotch "stockings and thules under light duties—and since the Eng-"lish thules *have almost annihilated our flourishing fabrics of "lace, there is good reason to believe, that those poor women* [engaged in the manufacture of lace] "*earn at present but four "sous per day.*"

Here we have another fair experiment of the plausible theory which Judge Cooper so strenuously advocates, with its calamitous consequences. It holds out to the United States "*a solemn warning*" against the fascinations of letting "trade regulate itself"—and exposing national industry to destruction from foreign rivalship.

Thus we find the "*repentant examples*" of Europe, invoked to his aid by Judge Cooper, recoiling on him, and overwhelming his system beyond the power of revival.

HAMILTON.

Philadelphia, Jan. 1, 1824.

No. II.

"If by balance of trade, be meant buying more than you "pay for, this can never be a *permanent evil.* Those who "give you credit, will stop that credit very speedily if they "find you do not merit it, by paying your debts with reason- "able punctuality. Merchants are too sharp-sighted to con- "tinue supplying a customer who does not pay them. We "may safely assert that *this is an evil which will surely cure* "*itself.*" p. 19.

This is a truly consoling theory for prodigal individuals and for incompetent statesmen. However they may squander their resources, either public or private, it can be no "*permanent evil.*" A spendthrift heir, who lavishes away his patrimony, and becomes bankrupt, is rescued from any "*permanent evil*"—for as soon as he is unable "*to pay his debts with reasonable punctuality*" his creditors will "*stop the credit!*" So an incompetent statseman, who brings his country to distress and wretchedness, as has been the case with Spain for centuries, may console himself and his countrymen with the cheering assurance that this is no "*permanent evil*"—as, being no longer "*able to pay with reasonable punctuality,*" they *will have no more* "*credit.*" It is painful to think that gentlemen of splendid talents can hazard such doctrines.

Let us suppose, however, that it is no "*permanent* evil;" that poverty, and distress, and incapacity "to pay debts" with "*reasonable punctuality,*" will, after the infliction of *temporary* evils, produce a change; is this beau ideal of the future any alleviation of present suffering? Was it any consolation to the many hundreds whom "*buying more* "*than we sold*" in 1815 and 1816, reduced to bankruptcy in 1817, 1818 and 1819, that halcyon days of peace and prosperity were supposed to be discoverable ahead? Does it relieve the population of Kentucky and Tennessee, to believe, if they can believe it, that their sufferings are no "*permanent evil,*" because "*this evil may cure itself*" in one, two, three, or four years?

To conclude this part of the subject. The evil is "*per-* "*manent,*" so long as the system which produced it is "*permanent;*" witness Spain, Portugal, Italy, Poland, and Ireland. It is "*temporary,*" as soon as the nation recovers from her delirium, and, like Russia, adopts the saving system of protecting national industry.

"If I can buy of my neighbour any commodity, cheaper "than I can make it at home, I save the difference of expense "by buying it; and *I am more profitably employed in making* "*some exchangeable commodity for my neighbour cheaper than*

"*he can make it*, than by making the article that I want from "him. As every nation is no more than an associated collection "of individuals, what applies to each individual, applies to "the nation." p. 7.

This is a hackuied argument, which was barely plausible, but destitute of solidity, during the wars of the French revolution, when the European markets were open for all our productions, and when they all brought high prices. Even then, a portion of our industry employed on cottons and woollens, would have increased the wealth of the nation to the amount of 10 or 12,000,000 dollars per annum, and saved us from the ineffable disgrace of being unable to provide 5 or 6000 dollars worth of blankets for the Indians during the non-intercourse with Great Britain, a stain on the escutcheon of our policy never to be effaced. Our manufacture of cottons, woollens, and iron wares might, by a proper policy, have been firmly established on a large scale previously to the commencement of the war, and the nation would have avoided the immense disadvantage it underwent during its continuance.

But the argument is devested of even the slightest appearance of plausibility, under the existing order of things, when the grand staples of above one-half of the people of the U. S. are excluded from almost every port in Europe, where our "*cheaper exchangeable commodi-*"*ties*," will not be received on any terms; when the demands of the world for our productions have become circumscribed within the narrowest limits; and when the rude produce of the soil is by its superabundance reduced so low as but very indifferently to remunerate the farmer and planter. Under these circumstances, our citizens would surely be better employed in making "*the* "*articles they want*" than receiving them from other nations without reciprocity. Common sense dictates, that every subtraction from the labours of the field inevitably tends to raise the market for the farmer and planter—every addition, to depress it. Every addition to the manufacturing class tends to brighten the prospects of the agriculturists—every deduction to cloud them. These points are so plain and so clear, and speak so loudly to the best interests of the farmers and planters, that it is astonishing how they can be so far misunderstood.

"When gold and silver are scarce among us, the nations "who possess these metals in great plenty, *are glad to sell* "*them at the increased price, occasioned by the increased de-*"*mand; so that in a short time, the supply and the demand, in*

"*this as in every other commodity, are sure to equalize them-*
"*selves.* [I beg the reader to bear in remembrance this strong expression—"*are sure to equalize themselves.*"] We send our "home products to the market where specie is for sale." p. 18.

This plausible, but fallacious theory, was first broached by Adam Smith, and is uniformly supported by all his followers. But, tested by facts, the true touchstone of all theories, its unsoundness becomes apparent to the most superficial observer. This test we can apply unerringly without departing from our own continent, or retrograding to distant periods. Kentucky and Tennessee have for years writhed in extreme distress, in consequence of the want of specie, by which they have been driven to a variety of miserable expedients to rescue the debtors, who compose a considerable portion of the population, from impending ruin. These expedients menace the union ultimately with serious consequences.—Those states, nevertheless, abound with the most valuable of the fruits of the earth, which are at the most reduced rates. That is to say, the precious metals are at greatly "*increased prices.*" Here, then, has long been fair scope for the operation of Judge Cooper's maxim—and here, as in every other case in which it is tried, it is "*found wanting.*" "*The nations which possess those* "*metals in greater plenty,*" are so far from being "*glad to* "*buy their home products at the reduced prices,*" as Judge Cooper states, that some of the most valuable they will not buy at any price whatever. "*The supply and de-*
"*mand,*" do not, as we are so very confidently assured by the Judge, "*equalize themselves.*" He thus overlooks a strong fact, which stared him in the face, and ought to have flashed conviction on his mind, as to the untenable nature of his favourite theory. No specie flows in there to relieve the public distress. The evil is as great as it was five years since—and, without a radical change in our policy, there is scarcely a hope of an amelioration. Whereas, had those states the power of prohibiting the consumption of foreign goods even for two years, a regeneration would take place—prosperity would once more visit the land—specie would flow in upon them—industry would revive—and tender laws, and all their demoralizing train of evils would disappear.

"By *forcing capital* into a manufacture that did not previ-
"ously flourish, without legislative aid, you diminish the ca-
"pital of the country, without even a chance of increasing
"its industry. Thus, there has been a great outcry lately in
"England from the mischief produced by restrictive duties
"on the lumber and iron of Sweden and Russia. The iron

"manufacturers in England, and the lumber merchants of "Canada, said, let us supply you; we are your own people. "They succeeded; the consequence was, that *all the manu-* "*factures* usually sent to Sweden and Russia, to buy iron "and lumber, were stopped; and the home trade of the "country paralized to the whole amount of the former expor- "tation." p. 12.

Here are postulata laid down, and examples cited by way of illustration, of which the former are wholly inadmissible, and the latter without foundation.

Let us examine them in order. "*Forcing capital,*" is one of those cabalistic terms, which, without any substantial meaning, have a powerful effect on weak nerves. Let us test it by the talisman of reason and common sense.

We import immense quantities of Leghorn hats and merino shawls, which drain our country of its specie: and we have thousands of men, women and children, who, if properly encouraged, could manufacture these articles of equal quality and at lower rates. If a duty were laid on them of 40 per cent. which would abridge their introduction here, it would afford employment to persons who would otherwise be idle, and induce capitalists to enter on the business. This is what, in the mystical language of the disciples of Adam Smith, is called "*forcing capi-* "*tal.*" I earnestly request the reader to give this subject a calm and sober consideration suited to its importance—and to ask himself, in the first place, whether it is not an abuse of terms to style this measure "*forcing capital?*"—and also, whether, instead of "*diminishing capital,*" as it is erroneously termed, it is not a most advantageous *increase* of productive capital, greatly tending to advance national prosperity?

Now to the Judge's assumption of examples. Here he has been still more unfortunate than in his theory. The exports from Great Britain to Russia were on the increase till the operation of her new tariff, which has no possible connexion with the "outcry of the iron manufacturers in "England" and "the lumber merchants of Canada." The exports in 1820, were only $7,200,000—whereas they rose in 1821 to $11,250,000.[3] I have no document on the subject for 1822 or 1823.

HAMILTON.

Philadelphia, Jan. 5, 1824.

[3] Holt's Administration of the Affairs of Great Britain, p. 102. Sent to Mr. Clay for the inspection of the government.

Examination of Judge Cooper's "Tract on the Modification of the Tariff."

No. III.

"In Europe, it has been so long and so decidedly settled "on full argument, both among theoretical and practical men, "that *government has never at any time, or in any country, in-* "*terfered to regulate and direct the employment of private capi-* "*tal, without producing mischief*, that the agitation of such a "question at this day, is an unlooked for case in the history "of political economy." p. 3.

There scarcely ever was a more erroneous position, or one more uniformly contradicted by the experience of nations, than this, which is advanced with all the confidence which the best established facts could inspire. As this is a cardinal point, on which the merits of this great question turns, I shall enter into some detail on it. But first I think it necessary to define the term "*directing "the employment of private capital.*" This must mean the imposition of protecting duties, or giving bounties; otherwise it should have no place here. Now let us unfold the historic page, to test this grand postulatum.

When Edward IV. assumed the English sceptre, England was in a very low state, as regarded arts, manufactures, commerce, and general prosperity. She depended upon her continental neighbours, as we do on Europe, for some of the articles most necessary for comfort; among the rest for a large portion of her clothing. Her wool was shipped to Flanders, (as our cotton is to Europe,)—there worked up—and returned in cloth at three, four, five, and ten-fold its original value. Flanders was then one of the richest and most flourishing countries in Europe—England among the poorest. Edward, as wise a prince as ever wielded the English sceptre, saw the utter impolicy of the system, and at once applied a remedy. He prohibited the introduction of a great variety of articles, above seventy, among which the most conspicuous were woollen cloths, manufactures of leather, laces, silks, and various kinds of iron wares. Here was an instance of "*a regulation and direction of "the employment of private capital,*" which, as Judge Cooper unqualifiedly states, "*never at any time, or in "any country*" took place, "*without producing mis-"chief.*" Yet I unhesitatingly appeal to Judge Cooper and to his friends, whether, in this particular instance, it "*produced mischief?*" They must answer distinctly—No. It first laid, according to the concurring

testimony of all the historians and political economists who have written on the subject, the solid foundations of the prosperity of England. Her wealth, formerly lavished in Flanders and France, was thenceforward retained at home, to promote her internal industry and add to her national resources. And great numbers of the most valuable of the productive classes of society, who had worked for England abroad, immigrated into that country, and enriched it by their talents, their industry, and their capitals.

I might rest the cause on this single case, as it is decisive and irresistible. It proves, beyond the power of cavil or doubt, that Judge Cooper's proposition, the basis of his system, is radically and incurably erroneous; and that the interference of government to protect industry by prohibitions, not only does not "*produce mischief*," but is fruitful of great and lasting benefits.

But "to make assurance doubly sure," I shall add other examples equally conclusive.

Great Britain has more recently "*interfered to direct "the employment of private capital*," in the cotton and silk branches, to pass over all others. Let us see the result. She raises no cotton. Her manufactures of that article in 1783 were only £960,000 sterling.[1] By protection, and "*directing the employment of private capi-"tal*," it has arisen to £40,000,000, or $180,000,000 last year, and the mere export was, according to the official returns, £21,639,000. The domestic consumption was about the same. The raw material cost her only $22,500,000, leaving a clear national gain of $157,500,000. How were these magnificent results accomplished—the greatest product of human industry ever obtained from a single article? By what is quaintly and vituperatively termed "*directing the employment of private "capital.*" Thus the profitable employment of 1,500,000 people, and a national gain of $157,500,000, result from measures which Judge Cooper gravely informs us, have never been adopted in any country "*without producing "mischief.*" Such is the discrepancy between fact and assumption in the writings of the followers of Adam Smith, as well as in those of their great master himself. But for the "*interference*" so much deprecated by those gentlemen, the East Indies, where the manufacture has been esta-

[1] Macpherson's Annals, Vol. IV. p. 16.

blished three thousand years, and where labour is cheaper than in any other part of the world, would continue to supply Great Britain with this article; drain her of her wealth; and deprive a million and a half of people of profitable employment. Only observe the immense contrast. In the present case Great Britain lays almost all the nations of the world under contribution by this important manufacture; whereas, in the other, she would be drained of her wealth, and instead of exporting cotton goods to the amount of $ 97,000.000 per annum, would probably import to the amount of a third or a fourth part of that sum.

Again. By "*the direction of the employment of private capital*" she has fostered the silk manufacture to such extent, that its product last year was $ 45,000,000.

In one word, Great Britain owes her immense superiority over the other nations of Europe, in point of wealth, power and resources, to this single cause. Her government is expensive. Labour is dearer there than on the continent, where the people are as industrious as the English, and Great Britain does not enjoy natural advantages equal to several of those nations. But the vigilant protection of the national manufactures has so far advanced her wealth, power, and resources, that she has been the pivot on which the destinies of Europe lately turned, and been enabled to subsidize the monarchs, and keep in motion the armies, of that quarter of the globe during a large portion of the wars of the French revolution.

When Henry IV. one of the wisest princes that ever ruled France, or perhaps any other country, ascended the throne, he found the kingdom impoverished by a long succession of the most sanguinary and desolating civil wars. Arts and manufactures, commerce and general prosperity, were at the lowest ebb. The nation was completely impoverished. He "*interfered to direct the employment of private capital,*" to use the favourite language of Judge Cooper, by bounties, prohibitions, premiums, and immunities. What was the result? In a short reign he rendered his kingdom one of the most prosperous in Europe.

France still pursues this system—and has by its means extricated herself from the disasters of long-continued wars—the devastations of infuriated armies which possessed her soil for three years—and the tribute of about $ 100,000,000, paid to her conquerors.

Again. Frederic the Great, of Prussia, at the close of the dreadful wars of the Austrian succession, found his kingdom in about the same state as Henry IV. had found France. This statesman, likewise, in opposition to the sage maxims so confidently promulgated by Adam Smith, John Baptiste Say, and their followers, "*interfered to "direct the employment of private capital*"—and, so far as wealth and prosperity were concerned, completely revolutionized Prussia in a few years. He commenced by giving premiums for improvements in the arts—prohibiting rival articles—making loans to manufacturers—and by every mode in his power accelerating the progress of industry. In two years, in bounties and premiums, he expended 265,448 crowns. In consequence, there was in a few years an immense increase of the exports, the wealth, the prosperity, and the resources of Prussia.

These cases are undoubtedly sufficient to establish the error of Judge Cooper's position. But I will add one drawn from our own history.

At the organization of our government, our tonnage was on the lowest scale. It was inadequate for our commerce, unimportant as that commerce was. Congress took efficient measures for its protection and advancement, by "*interfering to direct the employment of private "capital.*" They laid heavy duties on foreign tonnage —fifty cents per ton for *every entry in the coasting trade*, whereas American vessels paid only six cents once a year. Foreign vessels, in the foreign trade, paid fifty cents, American vessels but six cents, for every entry. The duties on teas imported in American vessels were, in 1789, fixed at an average of 12 cents per lb. but on foreign vessels at 27 cents—being 125 per cent. advance. Ten per cent. extra was imposed on the duties on goods imported in foreign vessels. What was the result? This "*direc-"tion of the employment of private capital*" in a few years raised the United States from the low ebb of 1789 to the second rank among the nations of the earth, in respect to tonnage. In three years, our tonnage was nearly trebled. In twelve it was multiplied five-fold—from 201,562 tons in 1789, to 1,033,218 in 1801. So much for the strong declaration of Judge Cooper, that "*government has never at any time or in any country, "interfered to direct the employment of private capital, "without producing mischief.*"

Philadelphia, Jan. 12, 1824. HAMILTON.

No. IV.

"Where manufacturers, bred up to the business, under-
"stand it, personally superintend and conduct it, with a
"view to minute savings, moderate profits, and reasonable
"economy, without over-trading their capital, they have in
"*all cases* succeeded: but this class of men require the ope-
"ration of a steady, unfluctuating system: mark the fact;
"*these men are not among the petitioners in favour of the ta-*
"*riff.*" p. 10.

Here is an egregious error, which fully proves, that a gentleman may possess great talents, and be highly eminent in his profession, and yet be utterly incompetent to decide on points unconnected with that profession, particularly when located remote from the scenes he undertakes to descant on. The woollen manufacturers of New England are generally, if not universally, prudent, economical, and intelligent—and have every possible advantage in the prosecution of their business. Their statement is in direct contradiction to that of Judge Cooper; —and it is presumable that they know their own situation better than he possibly can. Those of Providence, in a recent memorial to congress, feelingly depict their distresses, their sufferings, and "gloomy prospects." Their declarations, which coincide with those of the same class in Boston, Hartford, and other quarters, are,

"That large sums have been invested in mills and ma-
"chinery for manufacturing wool in the State of Rhode Island
"and its vicinity, and numerous workmen have derived em-
"ployment from their operation. That during the late war
"with Great Britain, these manufactories were principally
"established, when they afforded, even in their infancy,
"great relief to the wants of the country—they have since,
"without protection, been gradually increasing, until excessive
"importations of foreign manufactured woollens have finally
"discouraged further investment of capital. From this cause
"it is estimated that *the operation of more than one-half of*
"*these mills is at present suspended!* In some instances the
"machinery for wool has been laid aside, and other machinery
"employed in place of it. Those, who, in the hope of some
"favourable change, still continue the manufacture of wool,
"*have gloomy prospects before them!*"

The above statement establishes one of two things incontestibly—either Judge Cooper is fundamentally wrong —or these manufacturers are attempting a base deceit on the public. The latter alternative is inadmissible.

"*All* the manufacturers that have failed, have failed from
"the unnatural competition, and extravagant expectations,
"which these hot head experiments have given rise to. All
"that have succeeded, have succeeded from plain, obvious
"and natural causes: *not by aid of prohibitory duties, but in*
"*spite of them!*" p. 10.

Here is a striking instance of the sweeping mode of assertion used by Judge Cooper. Hundreds of manufacturers failed between the close of the war and the year 1821. There is not a practical man in our cities, who does not know, that the grand cause of their failure was the want of a market, in consequence of the immoderate importations of rival articles. Yet Judge Cooper unqualifiedly asserts that "*all*" have failed from "unnatural "competition" and "extravagant expectation." To this point blank assertion, it may be sufficient to oppose a mere simple denial. Numbers of those who failed, were as prudent, as careful, as intelligent, and as economical as any persons in the United States. Their failure arose for want of that fostering care which Great Britain, France, Russia, Austria, and nearly all the nations of Europe, extend to their manufacturers.

The error of the second part of this paragraph is far more extraordinary than the other, and must excite astonishment. The Judge boldly asserts, that such of our manufacturers as have been successful, "*have succeeded, not by aid of prohibitory duties, but in spite of them!*"

I could scarcely persuade myself on the first perusal, that such an extravagant paradox, so utterly devoid of even the appearance of plausibility, could have been hazarded. A prohibitory duty excludes a foreign article;—take coarse cottons, for instance. Before that duty was imposed, our citizens were unable to establish the manufacture but on a very limited scale. Since that time it has been extended, and has wonderfully flourished; because the American manufacturer is secured in the home market. And yet we are assured, in sober seriousness, by Judge Cooper, that this very important manufacture succeeded "*in spite of prohibitory duties.*" What next? As well might we assert that the earth "brought forth "its fruits in due season," in "spite" of genial suns or refreshing rains, as that manufactures flourish "*in spite of prohibitory duties.*"

"*If your capital be fully employed, your industry is at its "speed. If* commerce and manufactures yield the same interest, they equally foster national industry, which is not promoted but retarded by forcing a capital employed in the "one, into the other." p. 20.

"*If* capital, employed in commerce, bring 15 per cent. and "capital employed in machinery bring 15 per cent., there is "nothing gained by converting the one into the other." p. 21.

Here are three *ifs* in succession—to which it might be sufficient to reply by three other *ifs*, putting the hypo-

theses in the negative form. Let it suffice to say, that, unfortunately, mercantile capital is, in a great degree, unproductive—and that there is, as I have already observed, an immense mass of dormant capital in the country. If any new and profitable mode of employing it, were opened to our citizens, $ 50,000,000 of capital would be put into active operation within six months, in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Wilmington, &c.

"Is it a trifle to take away TEN MILLIONS OF DOL-"LARS ANNUALLY FROM OUR FARMERS? *Yet* "*this is the fact!* this is the substance of the scheme in con-"templation! For instance, in the year ending the 22d of "September, 1822, we imported of foreign commodities "83,241,541 dollars, (in round numbers 83¼ millions.) This "is the importing price. The consumer paid for these at "least 100 millions of dollars. *The proposed tariff amounts to* "*an additional ten per cent. at the very lowest calculation, in* "*favour of the manufacturer; and one-tenth of an hundred is* "*ten.*" p. 9.

This is a tissue of most extraordinary errors, and fully establishes two important points—one, the cursory manner in which Judge Cooper has viewed this important subject—the other, the extent to which party excitement misleads its votaries, and blinds their judgment. To three of those errors, all vital, I shall confine myself.

First error. It is assumed that the whole of our imports are consumed in the United States.

Second error. That all of them are to be subject to increased duties by the proposed tariff.

Third error. That the agriculturists consume the whole of those imports, and therefore pay *all the duties.*

Let us try the Judge's statement, by the test of figures, which will place the matter in a clear point of view—

Our imports are correctly stated at -		$ 83,241,541
From which are to be deducted		
Specie and bullion, -	$ 3,369,846	
Re-exportations of Merchandise	11,101,306	
		14,471,152
Hence $ 83,000,000 are reduced to -		68,770,389
But we do not stop here—we have further deductions to make—	$	
Raw materials imported -	9,679,188	
Wines, exclusive of re-exportations	1,607,232	
Teas, do	1,160,579	
Coffee, do	3,899,042	
Spirits, do	2,015,589	
Sugar, do	3,974,870	
Molasses, do	2,393,943	
		24,730,443
		44,039,946

Here we find Judge Cooper's terrific sum of 100,000,000 of dollars reduced to less than one-half.	$ 44,039,946
There is a further reduction. We imported last year, of silks $5,824,666, and of linens, $ 3,766,643 exclusive of re-exportations of these articles. A duty to be laid on silks and linens is not for the protection of manufactures—and therefore these two sums must likewise be deducted, - -	9,591,809
Balance - - - - -	$ 34,448,637

Thus the articles proposed to be subjected to additional duties for the protection of manufactures, which Judge Cooper swells up to $ 100,000,000, of which "$10,000,000 *annually are to be taken from our farmers!*" sink down to about $ 34,000,000. At ten per cent. this would make the duties $3,400,000. But is this all "*taken from our farmers,*" as Judge Cooper asserts? Are "farmers," for whose welfare he is so solicitous, the sole consumers of imported goods? No. They probably do not consume one-third—certainly not one-half. It is probable that of superfine broad cloths, chintzes, carpets, girandoles, Cashmere and Merino shawls, elegant cutlery, &c. &c. there is a greater amount consumed by the inhabitants of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Richmond, Norfolk, Charleston, Savannah, &c. than by three-fourths of all the farmers in the United States. Thus $ 10,000,000 "*taken from our farmers*" is reduced to about $ 1,700,000—or less than a quarter dollar a head. Even this small amount is on the supposition that the protection of manufactures enhances their price. But we have sound theory, and strong facts, against this supposition. The theory is Alexander Hamilton's, often quoted, but hitherto unfortunately in vain—

"Though it were true, that the immediate effect of regulations controlling the competition of foreign with domestic fabrics, was an increase of price, it is universally true, that the contrary is the ultimate effect with every successful manufacture. When a domestic manufacture has attained to perfection, and has engaged in the prosecution of it, a competent number of persons, *it invariably becomes cheaper.* * * * The internal competition which takes place, soon does away every thing like monopoly; and by degrees *reduces the price of the article to the minimum of a reasonable profit on the capital employed.* This accords with the reason of the thing, and with experience."

The facts are:—coarse cottons, yarn, nails, almost all the chemicals, manufactures of leather generally, and various other articles, being adequately protected, are made better and sold cheaper than the imported rival ones.

Philadelphia, Jan. 13, 1824. HAMILTON.

Examination of Judge Cooper's "Tract on the Modification of the Tariff."

No. V.

"While we have been agitating the question here, the "ministry and the Parliament of Great Britain, lamenting "the intricacy of their restrictive and prohibitory system, "*declare their wish to get rid of it as soon as they can.*" p. 12.

The people of the United States have been for three or four years amused with the idea that Great Britain is desirous of extricating herself from the restrictive system, as pernicious to her interests, but is unable, it being so inveterate an evil. Why not? She has every possible advantage in her power. She has the most complete machinery, the largest capitals invested in manufactures, and the wealthiest merchants in the world. And, were she desirous to carry into operation the plausible, but fallacious maxim of "*letting trade regulate itself,*" she might fairly venture on it. She might, with less danger than any other nation, admit the fabrics of all the world, to a competition in her own markets. No nation ever stood on more advantageous ground for the experiment. But she dares not do it. Notwithstanding her immense superiority in so many important points, she would be deeply injured by it. She would be undersold in her own markets, by some of the continental nations, among whom labour is cheaper, and who have certain raw materials in abundance, which Great Britain does not furnish. They would, moreover, consign to her, as she does to us, their refuse goods, to be sacrificed by auction.

On this point, a point on which much misinformation prevails, I offer the most incontrovertible evidence, which I trust will prevent this argument being ever again obtruded on the public. There is now before me, the British tariff, enacted in 1819, and published in 1820, about the time when these syren tales were first propagated. If there were any foundation for them, if Great Britain were disposed to try any experiment on the subject, she would then have made a commencement. But this tariff does not afford the least countenance to them. Every page, every line, carries in strong and indelible characters, the marks of the restrictive system. The old duties are consolidated, and the new are, in general, full as high as formerly—some a little more, some a little less. Nine-tenths of the enumerated manufactures, and *all the non-enumerated*, are subject to *fifty per cent.* Those of cotton and leather pay *seventy-five per cent.!*—linen sails, *one hundred and four!*—and chequered and

printed linen, *one hundred and seventy-two!* How, then, can gentlemen venture to impress the world with an opinion of any relaxation of system on the part of Great Britain? The distresses and discontents of her West India colonies, have driven her to modify the rigour of her colonial system, by allowing those colonies to export their produce to the continent of Europe—and, for the purpose of rendering the island the emporium of the world, she has altered her system as to the storing of goods. But the *exclusion of foreign manufactures from consumption in Great Britain,* which is the grand point at issue, is as strict and rigorous as ever.

"If we must not purchase the manufactures of Great Bri-
"tain, the latter will not purchase our cotton, rice, or tobacco."
"I appeal to men conversant with the subject, that she can
"supply herself *in half a dozen or ten years* elsewhere; with
"rice from the East Indies, cotton from Brazil, and *tobacco*
"*from the Crimea.* She does not, because she purchases the
"raw material with the produce of her own warehouses: and
"the trade is mutually gainful." p. 14.

From these views it would appear that Judge Cooper believes that Great Britain purchases more from us than we do from her;—that she has no other means of paying for those purchases but by her manufactures;—that it is proposed to exclude them altogether;—and that she can and will supply herself with substitutes for our produce elsewhere. How utterly erroneous such deductions would be, appears from the following statement of our trade with Great Britain and Ireland.

Imports from Great Britain and Ireland in 1822.		*Domestic exports to Great Britain and Ireland in* 1822.	
	$		$
Woollens - -	11,384,003	Bread-stuffs -	00,000,000
Cottons - -	8,106,381	Cotton - -	18,752,286
Woollen & cotton hose	843,576	Tobacco - - -	2,691,292
Linens - - -	2,981,844	Pot and pearl ashes	142,753
Earthen & stone ware	1,096,566	Skins and furs -	223,865
Hempen goods -	324,738	Flaxseed - - -	390,031
Silks - - - -	304,682	Rice - - -	435,166
Copper and brass, and manufactures of both	474,861	Naval stores -	343,929
		Sundries - -	478,914
Iron and steel, and manufactures of both	3,491,865		
White lead, &c. -	256,645		
Salt - - - -	323,518		
Coals - - - -	117,714		
Glass - - - -	123,672		
Sundries - -	4,976,222		
	$34,806,287	Balance - -	$11,348,051
			$34,806,287
Balance - - -	$11,348,001		

This enormous balance was made up by specie—by government and bank stocks—and by the proceeds of the trade of the United States with the rest of Europe, perhaps I might say with the whole world.

Here is a trade such as no country ever carried on with another since the days of the Tyrians and Phœnicians. Its advantages to Great Britain are transcendantly great—not merely because she has a balance in her favour of $11,000,000—but from the nature of the articles exchanged on both sides. Never was a trade carried on between two nations on such unequal terms—nor did any nation ever derive so much advantage from her colonies, even Spain from Mexico and Peru, as Great Britain does from the United States. Four-fifths of all the articles with which she supplies us, are elaborated to the highest possible degree. The raw materials are in many cases increased in value four, five, six, and in some even ten and twenty-fold. The average increase of the cotton is about eight-fold. Thus she paid us in 1822, for 114,464,156 lbs. of cotton exported to her, with about 15,000,000, lbs. and had the residue, nearly 100,000,000, to increase her "wealth, power, and resources." Four-fifths of what she furnishes us with, we could ourselves supply for our own consumption, were the policy of Franklin and Hamilton pursued. Whereas, almost every article she receives from us, is of indispensable necessity to her manufactures, and with four-fifths of them she could not be supplied elsewhere on any terms. Bread stuffs, one of our grand staples, formerly the first, and so late as 1817, the second, she prohibits altogether.

Notwithstanding this prohibition of so capital a staple of one of her most valuable customers, which operates so perniciously on the vital interests of the grain-growing states, and on those of the whole union, whose means of paying for its foreign supplies are thus so much curtailed —a prohibition, which, in strict justice, ought to have been long since reciprocated by absolute prohibition of some article of equal importance—notwithstanding this, I say, a citizen of the United States has the imprudence to threaten Congress with the wrath and indignation of Great Britain, if they dare make the insignificant addition of ten per cent. to the duties on some of her manufactures!!! Such conduct cannot be viewed without astonishment. The mind revolts at the idea of the state of dependence to which Judge Cooper would reduce the

United States. It is little short of recolonization, if, while Great Britain can prohibit one of our chief agricultural productions at pleasure, to secure her farmers the entire domestic market, we must not dare even to increase our duties for the protection of our citizens, and to prevent their being excluded from the home market!! for if we do, Great Britain, in order to avenge the injury, is to foster and encourage rivals on the Black Sea and in the Brazils, to ruin our cotton and tobacco planters; which friendly purpose she is to accomplish in "*half a "dozen or ten years.*" Risum teneatis, amici?

But the idea is too absurd for argument. As well might the merchants of New York threaten the people of Albany, that they would not buy any of the wheat, rye, flour, lumber, furs, skins, pot and pearl ashes, &c. &c. with which they pay for their purchases of merchandise, if they had the assurance to make any municipal regulations not perfectly agreeable to N. Y.—or the farmers in the neighbourhood of Philadelphia threaten our citizens that they would not furnish us with provisions, if we dared to purchase any foreign spirits, and did not confine ourselves to the use of their native peach brandy and rye whiskey—as Great Britain hold out any of the threats which Judge Cooper fulminates in her name. If we excluded by absolute prohibition, to the amount of $11,000,000 of her cotton and woollen goods, so as to reduce our purchases from her within hers from us, she would have no right to complain. It would be a mere act of retributive justice, in return for the prohibition of our bread stuffs. Even in that case she would still carry on with us the most lucrative trade she enjoys —a trade with which she could not dispense. The idea of Great Britain avenging herself by encouraging Brazil cotton to ruin our planters is too ludicrous. It would be a most egregious act of *felo de se*. If she could effect it, which she cannot, it would be a vital stab to her dearest interests. It would deprive us of the means of paying for the enormous amount we must always take of her manufactures.

Judge Cooper does not lisp a word of censure on Great Britain or France, for their prohibition of our bread stuffs—nor has he any sympathy for the sufferings of our farmers, resulting from that prohibition. No. All his sympathy is expended on the tobacco and cotton planters, who in "HALF A DOZEN OR TEN YEARS" *may suf-*

fer what the farmers *actually do suffer*, without the least effort on the part of our government to procure redress of the grievance.

If it were possible to heighten the absurdity of these threats, it would be by the fact, that the duties proposed to be laid on cottons and woollens, and other goods, are far less than those Great Britain imposes on similar articles. Her duty on cottons, as we have seen, is 75 per cent.—whereas, Mr. Baldwin's proposition was only 33.

I have said that bread stuffs were, in 1817, the second of our staples. The amounts of the three great ones, in that year, were,

Bread stuffs - - - - - -	$ 20,388,000
Cotton - - - - - - - -	22,637,414
Tobacco - - - - - - -	9,230,020

The first, partly in consequence of the exclusion from the European ports, sunk down, in 1822, to $ 6,187,944. Export of flour in 1817, 1,479,198 barrels, value $ 17,-751,476. Average of 1821, 1822, and 1823, 879,743 barrels, value $ 4,819,506!!!

Philadelphia, Jan. 16, 1824. HAMILTON.

No. VI.

Lord Chatham, of famous memory, had he the power, would not have allowed America to "*manufacture even a "hobnail.*" Judge Cooper advocates the same limitation of American industry voluntarily, which Chatham was disposed to effect by coercion. He would have us dependant on Europe even for arms and ammunition:—

"I do not believe that we need manufacture at home *even* "*our fire arms, or our gunpowder; for on six months notice,* "*we can always provide a sufficient stock of these implements,* "*and no war ever comes on so suddenly as to prevent us.*" p. 18.

We tried this miserable system previous to the late war, with numbers of our manufactures, particularly those of cotton, wool, and iron. The results were most calamitous—such results as leave a stain on our national escutcheon, not easily effaced. The country was found bare of many of the articles most necessary for human comfort—establishments were hastily erected for the purpose of supplying our wants—they had made considerable progress, when peace came and consigned their proprietors to destruction. It is believed by persons who

had good opportunities of ascertaining the fact, that in some situations, during the late war, more of our soldiers perished through the want of proper clothing to shelter them from the inclemency of the weather, than by the weapons of our enemies.

"There are many manufacturing establishments now in ex-
"istence, which require no further aid or protection. Nothing
"of the kind is necessary, where common skill, industry, pru-
"dence, and frugality are employed. I know from personal
"inquiry and observation, of so many cotton, woollen, and
"other establishments, whose prudent owners were acquiring
"fortunes by their industry, at the very height of Mr. Bald-
"win's lamentations, that no possible doubt can exist with me
"of the competence of the present system to afford all the
"protection that industry requires." p. 22.

That there were some manufacturing establishments prosperous at the time of proposing Mr. Baldwin's tariff, is indubitably true. But the great mass of the manufacturers were then in a state of extreme distress and suffering—large numbers of them were reduced to bankruptcy —and many were tottering on its verge, and finally failed, who would have been rescued, had that tariff been passed. No distress in any age or country was ever universal. Sunk and depressed as Ireland is, there are many manufacturers, many farmers, many merchants prospering. Does it thence follow that Ireland is prosperous? Kentucky experiences intense distress and embarrassment through the want of a metallic medium, and because she has not an adequate market for the bounties of nature so profusely bestowed on her. But go to Lexington and other towns in the state—go to many of the principal farm houses, and you will see every appearance of a high degree of prosperity. Many farmers and merchants are making fortunes. But would it be logical to infer from thence the general prosperity of the state?

"In the most depressed state of the agricultural market,
"the farmer revels at least in peace and superabundance."
p. 25.

This, like so many others of Judge Cooper's positions, is a mere petitio principii. In reply, I merely refer to the horrible distresses of the farmers in the middle states, in 1819 and 1820, and to the present situation of many of the farmers in Kentucky and Tennessee. But suppose a farmer to have, as he must necessarily have, a "*su-*
"*perabundance*" of the fruits of the earth, is that all he has to desire? Does that secure his comfort, if he has

not an adequate market for his surplus? In many parts of the western country extreme distress results from the low rates of agricultural produce, in consequence of the "*superabundance.*" It has not in some cases paid the expense of raising it. Grain crops were pastured in Kentucky in 1820, as not worth the expense of the sickle.

"It is acknowledged every where, that agricultural capital "is employed more directly and immediately to the advantage "of the community than any other, because it is more per- "manent—*less fluctuating in value*—not easily removeable— "not easily affected by external wars—producing articles of "the first necessity, as food, and the raw materials on which "manufactures and commerce are founded." p. 7.

It is not my intention to enter into a minute comparison of agriculture and manufactures. The task would be invidious and unprofitable. They are indispensible to each other. We might as well discuss the question, which is the most useful, the right leg or the left. Without manufactures and the mechanic arts, agriculture would be in a most deplorable state—and without agriculture, man would be reduced to prowl the woods with the savages. But the attempt so often made, to degrade and disparage manufactures, is as unjust as it is illiberal. Its utter want of foundation, and the incalculable importance of manufactures to agriculture, will appear in their true light, by a comparison of two countries, or two portions of the same country, in one of which agriculture forms the chief employment, and in the other agriculture and manufactures are harmoniously united. Compare the fertile plains of Italy and Spain with some of the most sterile counties in England. Compare the neighbourhood of Patterson, of Wilmington, and of Providence, with any of those parts of Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina, where agriculture engrosses the chief attention. The contrast is strong and striking, and would alone be sufficient to settle this question.

Sometimes, in the heat of argument, a polemical writer furnishes deadly weapons for his antagonist. Judge Cooper has unfortunately placed himself in this predicament, and on a vital point. One of his main arguments is derived from the "*imposition*" to which the agriculturists would be exposed by protecting or prohibitory duties, which would greatly enhance the profits of the manufacturers and the prices of manufactured goods. But this argument he himself sweeps away with the besom

of destruction, in five lines, in which he states the invariable effect of competition in the reduction of prices. But I shall let him plead the cause himself.

Cooper	*vs.*	*Cooper.*
"*The tariff will make the farmer give "four bushels of corn for an article that "heretofore cost him but three.*" p. 25.		"If cotton mills bring much grea- "ter than common profit, so many "people will have cotton mills, that "*in a year or two the profits will de-* "*crease to the common level.*" p. 21.

The first postulatum is so far from being true, that in those cases in which our government has tried the effect of prohibitory duties, the effect has been directly and invariably the reverse. The farmer at present does not give more than two bushels of grain for coarse cottons, nails, and various other articles that are sufficiently protected, which, quality considered, formerly cost him three.

"The experiment of endeavouring to make a manufacture "stand by itself, after a series of support by the leading- "strings and go-carts of prohibitions, bounties, and draw- "backs, has been tried in England, among others, with the "silk, the glass, the linen, the sail cloth, the cordage, the "hemp, the cotton, the woollen manufacture." p. 11.

Very true, Judge Cooper. Nothing more certain. The experiment has been tried in England of fostering domestic industry, by excluding foreign rivals; has been attended with the most triumphant success; elevated Great Britain to the high grade which she has attained; and is worthy of imitation by every statesman who is sincerely desirous of promoting the prosperity of his country.

"Lay no prohibitory duty, and the consumer has two "choices, the manufacturer at home, and the manufacturer "abroad; impose these duties, and he must buy and sell too "at the pleasure of the monopolist. So far from making the "farmer independent, as is pretended, it renders him the "slave of the monopolist at home. Moreover, if he be pre- "vented from selling his grain to foreigners, and purchasing "in return foreign produce, he is left at the mercy of the "home monopolist, both in buying and selling." p. 24.

Here is assertion, unsupported by fact. We had "*no "prohibitory duties*" on cottons and woollens, before the restrictive system began—yet the consumer had not "*two choices.*" We had no manufacture of either description "*at home*" that was worth notice. We were then at the mercy of the foreign manufacturer altogether.

HAMILTON.

Philadelphia, Jan. 19, 1824.

No. VII.

"*They are an associating, club-meeting, committee-forming,* "*paragraph-writing, pamphleteering, petitioning, memorializ-*" *ing, urging, teazing set of men.*" p. 11.

"Neither *the prophecies, the promises, or the statements of* "*these men, are to be trusted.*" p. 21.

"They may pledge themselves to any thing; for they know "they cannot be called on to redeem it. *They calculate the* "*imposition will last their time.*" p. 22.

On these abusive paragraphs, one of which charges a large and valuable class of citizens with downright "*im-*"*position,*" I shall only observe, that the spirit they display, is a full proof how very unfit a temper of mind Judge Cooper was in, for a calm and temperate discussion of this all-important topic.

"Another pretence is, to provide home markets for farm-"ing produce. *Will a manufacturer eat more than a farmer?* "*Will his machinery consume corn, and cattle, and flour.*" p. 24.

No, judge, machinery will not. But the people employed on it will. "*Will a manufacturer eat more than* "*a farmer?*" This is a very frivolous question, and must of course be answered in the negative. He will not. But does Judge Cooper pretend that manufacturers do not provide "*home markets for farming produce?*" That it makes no difference to farmers, whether their neighbours are farmers, like themselves, or manufacturers? He cannot surely—and yet this is the obvious import of his words, when he decorously talks of the "*pretence* of providing home markets." The difference is immense. In the one case, the manufacturer is a customer of the farmer—in the other, when he is himself converted into a farmer, as has been the constant tendency of our policy from the organization of the government, he becomes a rival. From this conversion of manufacturers into farmers, and farmers into planters, has arisen nearly all the distress suffered by farmers, planters, and manufacturers, since the close of the war—as well as the glut in the foreign markets, of all the staple productions of the country.

Adam Smith, to whose authority Judge Cooper will bow down, holds out an admirable lesson on this subject—

"*Whatever tends to diminish in any country the number of* "*artificers and manufacturers, tends to diminish the home mar-*"*ket, the most important of all markets for the rude produce of* "*the land; and thereby still further to discourage agriculture.*"

It is a fair corollary from this sound maxim, that what-

ever *increases* "the number of artificers and manufacturers," must, without any "*pretence*," necessarily *increase* "*the home market for farming produce.*"

"For the oppressive nature of Mr. Baldwin's proposals, on "the poor of the country—the aristocratic character of his "propositions—and the details of facts necessary to be attend-"ed to in this discussion, I refer to the very able pamphlet "of Mr. Cambreleng of New York." p. 17.

Judge Cooper attempts by extravagant panegyric to revive the credit of Mr. Cambreleng's fallacious work. But he has been singularly unfortunate in this particular point, the democratic nature of our tariff. Mr. C. in order to excite indignation and popular prejudice against Mr. Baldwin's proposed tariff, brands it as an aristocratic measure, and extols the original one as purely democratic:—

"*If the citizens of the United States want to see a democratic* "*tariff*," says Mr. Cambreleng, "*let them look at that of* "1790. * * * * * *Each man was then taxed, according to his* "*ability—and luxuries paid the highest rate of duty.*"

To show how cautiously the assertions of writers strongly excited in support of a cause, are to be received, and as an example of the enormous errors into which Mr. Cambreleng has fallen on a plain simple point, on which correct data were procurable without difficulty, I annex a few specimens of the "*democratic*" nature of this wonderful tariff, in which "*luxuries paid the highest* "*rate of duty.*"

Tariff of 1790.

	Per cent.		Per cent.
Bohea tea paid a duty of about	66	Broad-cloths, carpets, merino shawls, &c.	5
Salt	80	Chintzes, calicoes, silks, porcelain, &c.	5
Brown sugar	25		
Cheese	40		

So much for the wonderful accuracy of Mr. Cambreleng—and for the "*democratic tariff of* 1790." Now let us see the democracy of the existing tariff.

	Per cent.		Per cent.
Bohea tea pays at present	120	Silks, satins, cambric linens, bombazets, &c.	15
Souchong	150	Porcelain, elegant cutlery, girandoles, &c.	20
Salt	180	Superfine broad-cloths, chintzes, cashmere shawls	25
Brown sugar	100		

It is really an insult to the public understanding, to descant on the *democratic nature* of either the tariff of 1790, or the existing one. The above features are as oppressive and as aristocratic as those of any tariff in the most despotic country in Europe.

"Upon the principle of fostering home industry, *every shoe-*"*maker should be his own tailor*, hatter, watchmaker, joiner, "&c." p. 7.

True, Judge Cooper. Every *shoemaker* should be his own *tailor*, if the tailors will not buy his shoes; as we ought to manufacture for ourselves, since the manufacturing nations of Europe debar us of the poor privilege of feeding the workmen whom we employ among them.

"If it be said, the increase of home manufacture will sup-
"ply the consumers, *plentifully, and as cheaply;* I say this is
"interested and gratuitous prophecy, *falsified by the whole*
"*tenor of past fact.*" p. 9.

This is an assertion utterly unfounded. Coarse cottons, nails, chemicals, and various other articles, afford a complete refutation.

"Obedience to law, is the first duty of a citizen, but *it will*
"*never be paid to an unjust law.*" p. 17.

A law is "*unjust,*" and Judge Cooper invites the citizens to "disobey" it, which imposes $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. on cottons and woollens for the protection of one class of citizens, most of them in humble life—but it is not unjust to impose a duty of 100 per cent. on brown sugars, a necessary of life, for the protection of another, the wealthy planters of Louisiana!

"*We do not want specie at home.* We want it for two pur-
"poses only; for small market money; and to answer the
"occasional calls that are made to check imprudent bank is-
"sues." p. 18.

The youngest clerk in the city knows the ruinous effect of a drain of specie from a country. Every one of our citizens has felt it in 1817, 18, and 19. To the sufferings of Kentucky and Tennessee, arising solely from this cause, I have already referred.

"If it be meant, that the misfortune exists in being com-
"pelled to pay the balance against us in specie, *it amounts to*
"*nothing! for specie is only another name for the commodities we*
"*give for it!*" p. 19.

According to this wonderful logic, "*it amounts to no-*
"*thing*" that Spain has for centuries paid for the manufactures of England, France, and Germany, in "spe-
"cie"—for "*specie is but another name for the commo-*
"*ties she gave for it!!!*"

"It is absolutely necessary for the prosperity of a nation,
"that *the custom-house entries should exhibit a balance of im-*
"*port beyond export.*" p. 19.

Then we must be a most prosperous nation indeed—for our custom-house entries "*exhibit a balance of im-*
"*ports beyond exports.*" By a parity of reasoning, Great Britain must be going fast to destruction, for her custom-house entries of last year, unfortunately exhibited an

alarming balance of exports beyond imports, to the amount of $86,000,000!!!

"The tariff gentlemen weep over it as a loss, and predict "ruin to the nation from this dreadful excess of imports, "which has hitherto *enriched all concerned.*" p. 20.

How far "*all concerned*" have been "*enriched*" by our commerce, may be known by application to any of our merchants, of whom, very unfortunately, two-thirds, at the lowest computation, have failed since the commencement of the wars of the French revolution.

"It can never be imagined that they would confer on their "public servants the power of unequal and discretionary tax- "ation, so that at the will of the government one set of citi- "zens may be lightly, and another heavily burdened, or that "*the industry of one class should be fostered at the expense of* "*another, or sacrificed for the benefit of another.*" p. 4.

"*Congress has no right to act upon the tariff, but with the* "*fair and honest view of revenue, and of that only.*" p. 5.

This is mere declamation, without the shadow of foundation. It is too late to set up a constitutional objection against the protection of that portion of the national industry engaged in manufactures, after the government has, from its outset, acted on this principle with respect to commerce and agriculture. In a former number I stated the exorbitant duties imposed by the first congress on teas imported in, and the high tonnage duties on, foreign vessels; and the existing duty of ten cents per pound on manufactured tobacco and twelve cents on snuff, to pass over so many other cases wherewith our statute book abounds. I ask Judge Cooper, were these duties imposed "*with a fair and honest view to revenue,* "*and to that only?*" No. He will not venture such an assertion. Will any man, then, dare to say, that Congress has a right to lay exorbitant duties on tobacco and snuff, not with a "*view to revenue,*" but to secure to the tobacco planters the domestic consumption exclusively—and has no power to impose duties to prevent the manufacturer from being driven from the home market altogether, as, in many cases, he is at present?

"It is not prudent on the part of government, to foster any "branch of the national industry, in particular, by bounties, "by prohibitions, or prohibitory duties." p. 5.

Let Judge Cooper preach these doctrines to the planters of Virginia and Maryland, and to the merchants, whose respective pursuits, as above stated, have been fostered by "*prohibitory duties*" from the organization of the government to the present hour.

Philadelphia, Jan. 20th, 1824. HAMILTON.

No. VIII.

"*If* we convert among ourselves $1000 of the mercantile "industry, into a $1000 of manufacturing industry, we change "the form, but we add nothing to the amount of this portion "of the national industry." p. 13.

"Our national industry requires no fostering. *If there* "*be full employment for capital, you have all you can have.*" p. 20.

"The introduction of a new manufacture does not increase "the mass of industry, *if* it be set on foot by means of capital "already employed." p. 7.

These arguments rest on the slippery foundation of *ifs*—and fall to the ground at once, *if* there be not, as there really is not, "*full employment for our capital*"—and *if* the manufacture is established by capital unemployed. It cannot fail to tranquilize the apprehensions of Judge Cooper to be assured, that there is an immensity of capital now unemployed in this country, ready for any new branch of business to which our government may afford protection; and that an adequate protection of the fine cotton manufacture, now struggling into existence, would call into activity millions of money employed in trafficking in the funds. Most of the persons engaged in the cotton, woollen, and iron manufactures could at once increase their work people and their production, one-half, or two-thirds, on their present capitals, were they certain of a steady market. I will instance other manufactures by way of illustration. The production of books, carriages, and various other articles, might be doubled in this country, without drawing a dollar from any other branch of business, were the demand equal to what it was six or seven years ago.

After having endeavoured to excite the alarms of the government for its revenue—of the tobacco and cotton planters for their grand staples—of the community at large by the danger of imposition, Judge Cooper uses his main efforts to terrify the merchants by the destruction, which, he says, must inevitably befal their tonnage in the event of the passage of the intended modification of the tariff. Had the bill in question proposed to lay a duty of three or four dollars per ton on American shipping, in order to deprive it of employment altogether, it could not have warranted much more impassioned strains of declamation than the Judge has delivered. But let him be heard in his own words:—

"*Those who live without buying must live without selling.*" p. 14.

"If it be said, a total prohibition of imported articles is

" neither desired nor expected—I say, *the tariff goes for the* " *whole!!! What is omitted?* If it do not take place instantly, " *the system goes to the annihilation of all importation gradually* " *and even speedily.*" p. 9.

" What was the American freightage of last year? 813,748 " tons; which, at 60 dollars per ton, amounts to 48,824,880 " dollars." p. 19.

" Sixty dollars is the lowest present estimate—here is a " capital jeopardized by the tariff scheme, of near fifty mil- " lions of dollars. *For if our imports are to be cut off, our ex-* " *ports are to be cut off; no nation will trade with us on condi-* " *tion of buying our commodities with their gold and silver,* " because we refuse to take from them any thing else." p. 15.

" *If our imports are to be cut off, our exports are to* " *be cut off!*" When I was a lad, it was a common saying, which I hope the reader will excuse, " *If* the sky " falls, we shall catch larks." Judge Cooper deals largely in *ifs*—they are one of his grand resources. I have already pointed out several. It is too ludicrous to suppose that even doubling our duties, were that measure adopted, would " *cut off our imports.*" They were actually doubled during the war, and yet " *did not cut* " *off our imports.*"

But, let us examine this point. Woollen goods, of which we imported in 1822, above $ 11,000,000, at 25 per cent. were to be subjected to $33\frac{1}{3}$. That is to say, a yard of broad-cloth, at 8 dollars, which now pays a duty of about $2, would be subject to 266 cents. A yard of fine cottons, at one dollar, now paying 25 cents duty, would be subject to 33 cents. Now, I ask in the name of common sense, can any man, whose imagination is not overheated, persuade himself for a moment, that this measure would " *cut off our imports?*"—Can it be supposed that our gentlemen would abandon the use of foreign broadcloth, or our ladies that of fine imported muslins, because a coat would cost an additional dollar or two, or a gown an additional half dollar? It is painful to be obliged to combat such arguments.

It is difficult to conceive how Judge Cooper could have excited himself so far as to believe for a moment those terrific anticipations, from a measure so harmless in itself. Our exports are of such kinds, as the European nations cannot dispense with. So much for that portion of our foreign trade. Now with respect to our import trade, not a tenth part of our tonnage is employed in the freight of the goods proposed to be subjected to additional duties by Mr. Baldwin's tariff. Very nearly 40 per cent. of all our imports of 1822, were from England, from which country we receive at least two-thirds of all our foreign

manufactures—and Judge Cooper will learn with amazement, that the American *inward* tonnage employed in the Cuba trade, was very nearly equal to that from England in that year.

	Tons.
Inward American tonnage from England in 1822,	119,202
from Cuba -	118,405

So much for the threnody so mournfully sung over our tonnage! and so much also for "*selling us soul and "body,*" to the naval powers of Europe. Never were lamentations so miserably misemployed.

While, on the one hand, Judge Cooper threatens us, as we have seen, with the wrath of Great Britain, if we dare impose additional duties on foreign manufactures, it is wonderful that on the other, he clearly holds out an idea that such a measure might possibly proceed from her machinations, to arrest us in the career of prosperity; for he says, "*jealous of our commercial enterprise,*" and "*desirous of paralizing our ocean efforts,*" she might be led "*to bribe some of our influential men to get up "some plan to operate against our commerce and our "navy!!!*" And the proposed tariff he gives us clearly to understand, must, if adopted, have this tendency, and ultimately produce this effect!! But let him speak for himself:—

"Suppose Great Britain, jealous of our commercial enter-"prise, and our growing naval power, and desirous of para-"lizing our ocean efforts, *should be able to bribe some of our "influential men* to get up some plan to operate against our "commerce and our navy, is it within the compass of human "suggestion to devise a plan more effectual and more deci-"sive in its operation, than this proposal to render useless the "shipping of our country, and to prostrate the mercantile in-"terest? *Can any measure be devised more certain to sell us "soul and body to the naval powers of Europe, than the plan "now offered to Congress?*" p. 16.

Will not a critical examination of these passages, prove, as I have stated, that Judge Cooper in one page asserts that England might be suspected of an intention to procure by bribery and corruption the adoption of a measure, which, in another page, he depictures as so very hostile to her dearest interests, that it might lead her to attempt to undermine and ruin the producers of our two great staples, tobacco and cotton? Is not this blowing hot and cold with the same breath?

Our author descants very philanthropically on the kindness and good feelings that ought to exist among nations, and deprecates any thing that can interrupt this blessed state of brotherhood.

"A state of mutual wants, and mutual dependance, among

"nations, has been appointed by God Almighty in the com-
"mon order of nature." p. 12.

"This system paralizes all national intercourse; we shut
"our doors against each other." p. 13.

"It creates the hostile feeling of retaliation. I am well
"persuaded that to attack prohibitory duties by prohibitory
"duties, is always a measure adopted at the expense of the
"retaliating party: the latter pays for it." p. 13.

Judge Cooper's very impressive lectures on the ill consequences of "*paralizing national intercourse*," and "*creating hostile feelings of retaliation*," ought to have been preached to Great Britain and France, to prevent their exclnding our bread-stuffs. A person unacquainted with the subject, would naturally suppose, on reading those paragraphs, that the United States were the aggressors—that they had wantonly commenced a system of exclusion and restriction, on the unoffending powers of Europe. It would not be within human calculation, that we had passively borne absolute exclusion of one of our main staples for six years, and were now only about to have recourse to a moderate increase of duty, not in return for absolute exclusion, but for the protection of our own industry.

The imposition of additional duties, averaging ten per cent. according to judge Cooper, "*paralizes all national* "*intercourse.*" This is a mere gratuitous assertion, destitute of foundation. The lowest duty in Great Britain, is higher than the highest proposed by Mr. Baldwin, with a very few trivial exceptions. Does this "*paralize* "*all* national intercourse" on the part of Great Britain? Great Britain, France, Spain, Portugal, and almost every other nation in Europe, as already stated, actually prohibit our bread-stuffs; does this "*paralize all our in-*"*tercourse*" with them. To this pernicious measure we submit with Christian patience. We excluded from our ports British vessels arriving from the West Indies, in order to force an entry for our own, thus crippling the resources of our farmers by greatly abridging their markets. Yet even this bold measure did not "*paralize our* "*intercourse*" with the parent nation. Russia by a recent tariff has prohibited above three hundred articles. The French tariff abounds with prohibitions. And are we now to be told, in the face of these and a hundred other facts, equally cogent, that the proposed modification of our tariff is to "*paralize all national intercourse?*" It is truly astonishing how gentlemen of character and standing in society can commit themselves by such bold assertions.

Jan. 21, 1824. HAMILTON.

Examination of Judge Cooper's "Tract on the Modification of the Tariff."

No. IX.

"It is not practicable to guard the extent of smuggling "coast from Passamaquoddy to Georgia, and from the St. "Lawrence to Lake Erie." p. 16.

"Smuggling, in opposition to the proposed tariff, will be "accounted no crime: and it will effect its purpose of opposi- "tion in a way that every friend of his country must de- "plore." p. 17.

From the commencement of the government to the present hour, the danger of smuggling has been employed with great effect by those citizens hostile to the protection of manufactures. It has been constantly held out as a spectre to terrify the government and people, from any addition, however small, to the existing duties on *such manufactured articles*, as interfere with, and crush the national industry. But no danger of smuggling has ever been apprehended from exorbitant duties on such articles as do not interfere with our domestic industry. It is difficult to treat with seriousness the scruples on the subject of smuggling, from duties of $33\frac{1}{3}$ on fine muslins and woollens, when wines, and spirits, and teas, and pepper, &c. &c. pay duties of 50, 75, 100, and 150 per cent. If the subject were not too serious for the use of ridicule, the morbid sensibility on the one side, and the languid indifference on the other, would excite merriment.

"It is an axiom, founded on universal experience, that mo- "nopolists will forever continue to require monopoly." p. 22.

This odious word, "monopoly," is frequently used incorrectly by persons whose ignorance is their apology. But the use of it by a gentleman of Judge Cooper's erudition, to excite odium and hostility against a large body of his fellow citizens, is quite inexcusable. He must know that the word is wholly inapplicable. Monopoly means, according to Johnson, "*the exclusive privilege "of selling any thing.*" During the existence of our present form of government, there cannot be any "monopoly" in the country. Even in Great Britain there is nothing like a monopoly of any branch of manufactures.

"It is for the interest of the community, that there should

"be competition among them; it is their object to exclude "it." p. 11.

This is a mere gratuitous assertion, wholly unfounded. There has been no attempt to exclude "*competition*" in manufactures.

"Has there been one meeting of farmers, throughout the "United States, for the protection of agriculture against "this attack, which threatens in its consequences to be so "disastrous? Reflect for a moment on the consequences of "a retaliating prohibitory duty on our southern staples." p. 11.

To this confident query, which appears to call imperiously for a negative answer, I reply affirmatively. There have been several; and some of the memorials resolved on have been extremely indecorous, vituperative, and breathing, on the part of the memorialists, a spirit of extreme hostility towards their manufacturing fellow citizens.

"For thirty years, we have steadily pursued the prohibitory "system." p. 10.

One is lost in astonishment at the confident manner in which assertions are hazarded by Judge Cooper, which will not stand the test of examination. For 26 years of the operations of our government, there was not a single prohibitory duty imposed. The only duties professedly "*prohibitory*," ever imposed by this government, were those enacted in 1816 on coarse cottons—on yarn —and on nails. The result has proved the excellence of the system. The articles, as has been observed a hundred times, are made better and sold cheaper. The great mass of the duties were originally laid, and have been continued, merely with a view to revenue.

"Fluctuations there will be in every market. We have had "very few in this country to complain of, and those of but "very short duration, and dependent on circumstances over "which legislation has no control." p. 25.

Here are assertions which cannot be sustained. The most ruinous fluctuations have repeatedly taken place in the prices of agricultural productions, particularly cotton and tobacco, and have been by no means of short duration. It is not improbable that since the war $ 15,000,000 have been lost—and hundreds of persons ruined, by those fluctuations. The losses by cotton alone, in 1822, exceeded $ 4,000,000.

"Want of judgment, want of skill, want of prudence, want "of experience, want of attention, want of economy, and in "short, want of common sense. These have been the sources "of manufacturing failure shortly after the monopoly of the "war." p. 10.

Here are seven causes assigned for an effect not resulting from any or all of them. To extravagant importations nineteen-twentieths of the destruction may be fairly ascribed.

"Lord Liverpool has expressed this opinion [against the "prohibitory system:] a committee of the house of commons "has expressed this opinion: the merchants of London have "expressed this opinion; and a committee of the manufactu-"rers of Birmingham have published to the same effect." p. 12.

I have already asked, and now repeat the question, if such are their opinions, why do they not act upon them? Is not this a tub to catch the whale?

"Is there a bar of good iron, a sheet of good iron, a lb. "of good steel, made in America? *I have not seen it.* Is there "a lb. of good iron equal even to the second brands of Swe-"den? *I believe not.* Is there a bar of iron manufactured in "America out of which good and perfect steel can be made? "I have personally visited most of the forges, and all the "steel furnaces of Pennsylvania, and *half a dozen years ago* "*there was no such thing*" p. 13.

The reader may well be amazed at the perusal of this paragraph. Judge Cooper has been three or four years in South Carolina, at the head of a literary institution, which has debarred him of any opportunity of examining a subject on which he thus peremptorily decides. Before his departure, he was engaged in a variety of literary pursuits which put it wholly out of his power to pay that degree of attention to it which would warrant him to decide as he does *ex cathedrâ*. He now advances boldly into the arena, and decides authoritatively on the iron branch, with an—"*I have not seen it*"—and an "*I be-*"*lieve not.*" This was not to have been expected from a gentleman of his experience and skill—and is not the mode in which such an important question ought to have been handled. Judge Cooper might indulge his luxuriant fancy in the wide fields of speculation, in forming theories—but when he ventured on the terra firma of fact, he ought to present the world with the result of his

personal experience. His *not having seen good iron or steel*—or his "*belief* that there is none *manufactured here*," will not satisfy an enquiring public.

As this is a subject on which I cannot venture to pronounce from my own knowledge, I have applied to a respectable iron-master for information, from whose communication, I annex an extract:—

"The bar and sheet iron of America are not only equal, "but in some respects superior to what is imported, be- "ing more tough and pliable in the working, and equally "strong. A great proportion of the bar iron made in our "country is not only equal to the second brands of the iron "from Sweden, but is superior in most respects to even the "first brands. The fact is notorious, that when the mechanics "or machine-makers want iron of a superior quality for par- "ticular purposes, they invariably choose the American iron. "Then as regards the article of steel, it is well known, that "even as far back as the war of the Revolution, steel of per- "fectly good quality was made here in considerable quanti- "ties: and had there been sufficient encouragement held out, "long ere this, enough would have been made to have sup- "plied our country with it, of the best quality. That we "have the materials for it, there is not the smallest doubt, "and enterprize and ingenuity to apply them whenever we "are enabled to do so without the hazard of being ruined in "the attempt."

In addition to the above, I have procured the certificate of a respectable spring manufacturer, who testifies to the same effect:—

"I have used both English and American spring steel, and "found the latter fully equal to any of the former I have ever "worked. JOHN M'DANIEL.

Philadelphia, Jan. 20. 1824.

The subject is submitted to the decision of the reader, who will duly weigh Judge Cooper's *ipse dixit* against the above statements—and from the number of radical errors already established in the "*Tract*," on points far more plain, I entertain no doubt as to the result.

I could have gone far greater lengths, and pointed out many more errors in Judge Cooper's pamphlet. But I trust I have sufficiently satisfied the reader that his zeal has so completely led him astray, that he is a very unsafe guide on political economy.

Jan. 28th, 1824. HAMILTON.

THE END.

A TRACT

ON THE

PROPOSED ALTERATION OF THE TARIFF,

SUBMITTED TO THE CONSIDERATION

OF THE

MEMBERS FROM SOUTH CAROLINA,

IN THE ENSUING CONGRESS OF 1823–4.

BY THOMAS COOPER, M. D.

CHARLESTON:
PRINTED—1823.
PHILADELPHIA:
REPRINTED BY JOSEPH R. A. SKERRETT.
.....
1824.

ON THE TARIFF.

IT is proposed to alter the present TARIFF OF DUTIES on imported commodities; not for the fair and legitimate purpose of raising a necessary revenue, but for the partial and unjust purpose of compelling the people at a great expense to foster those home manufactures, which, in the present state of the country, cannot be carried on with profit. *In Europe, it has been so long and so decidedly settled on full argument, both among theoretical and practical men, that government has never, at any time, or in any country, interfered to regulate and direct the employment of private capital, without producing mischief: that the agitation of such a question at this day, is an unlooked for case in the history of political economy;*[1] especially in this country, where the facts and arguments are supposed to be familiar to *our legislators, who have the repentant example of Europe as a beacon to direct their course.*[2] I am sorry for our national reputation, that such a question should have been agitated in our national legislature—that any doubt should have rested upon it, in the present state of knowledge—or that a persevering clamour should approach so near to a disgraceful success.

Nothing new remains to be said on a subject so often, so long, and so ably mooted among the best informed writers, transatlantic and American: but, as the last and decisive effort is now making to involve our country in one of the most entangling and extensive evils of the old governments of Europe, I have thought that a brief statement of the arguments on the Tariff question, might answer the purpose of a text-book on the final struggle between right and wrong. With this view, I have drawn up, and submit to those who are concerned, the following pages.

During the war the national motto was "Free trade and Sailors' rights." They are much more in danger from Mr. Baldwin's bill, than from the British navy; while the planting interest of the southern states seems to look at this momentous question as if the existence of the southern states were not involved in it.

Of the right of congress to impose duties, for the purpose of regulating trade and commerce.—It will be

[1] Examination, page 9. [2] Idem, page 1.

conceded on all sides, that the great object of men who associate together in a political community, is, that they may enjoy in security the fruits of their own industry, paying for that security in the form of taxation, such portions of their acquirements as may be necessary for individual and national protection; assessed with as much regard to uniformity and equality, as circumstances will reasonably admit. *It can never be imagined that they would confer on their public servants the power of unequal and discretionary taxation, so that at the will of the government one set of citizens may be lightly, and another heavily burthened, or that the industry of one class should be fostered at the expense of another; or sacrificed for the benefit of another.*[3] Suppose the granting such a power to our public servants were proposed, and debated at the forming of a constitution, can it be conceived that there would be one member in favour of conferring this power a priori?

Accordingly, the very first article of the Constitution of the United States provides, as the very first thing to be attended to, that all imposts, duties and excises, shall be uniform throughout the United States. § viii. art. 1. And again, by § ix. art. 5. no preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or excise to the ports of one state over another.

Hence the discretionary power given to Congress to regulate trade and commerce, must be construed as a reasonable discretion, to be exercised in conformity to the first and main object of civil society, and the positive enactions of the other parts of the constitution. If, therefore, by means of imposts, duties, or excises, one part of the national industry is burthened more than another—one part of our citizens aided at the expense of another—one part of our commerce, internal or external, depressed that another may be fostered—the regulations producing this effect are unconstitutional and unjust. But this is manifestly and avowedly the case with the proposed prohibitory duties; by which manufacturing capital is fostered at the expense of the consumer of the articles, at the expense of the commerce of the country generally, and of those citizens in particular, whose products of home-industry, were usually exchanged for the articles

[3] Examination, p. 28.

of import meant to be prohibited. *Congress, therefore, has no right to act upon the tariff, but with the fair and honest view of revenue, and of that only;*[4] and in the exercise of the power thus committed to them, to use it as equally among all the states, and among all the classes of citizens, as can reasonably be expected: If by means of imposts and duties, the agriculturists of South Carolina, are compelled to contribute 300, or 500-000 dollars a-year to the manufacturers of Rhode-Island, can this be resolved into uniformity of taxation? What then is meant by regulating commerce? It may be regulated for purposes of revenue—for purposes of self-defence—for purposes of retaliation, to enforce reciprocity—for the purpose of insuring a constant supply of articles of the first necessity to our defensive warfare, as swords, fire-arms, gunpowder, &c. I do not say that either of these cases would constitute a case of expedience, but they may all be fairly contemplated as within the purview of the articles in question; and undoubtedly would not be opposed on the ground of right. But it cannot be regulated for the purpose of unequal protection. Moreover, the right of congress to alter the tariff under the proposed bill, is deduced from the power given to congress to regulate commerce. But the right to regulate commerce with foreign nations is one thing; the right to encourage home manufactures by prohibitory laws, is another. The proposed tariff will operate on commerce, not directly, but indirectly only—through the medium of another and prior operation, not within the powers conceded to congress; viz. by protecting one branch of national industry at the expense of another. The direct and immediate operation of the law will be on manufactures, not on commerce; and it may well be doubted whether this indirect assumption of power, not originally contemplated, and not directly conceded, can fairly be defended on the ground of RIGHT. Implied and constructive powers forebode no good to the Union.

It is not prudent on the part of the government, to foster any branch of the national industry in particular; by bounties, by prohibitions, or prohibitory duties.[5]

[4] Examination, p. 28. [5] Ibid.

Every nation is composed of its individual citizens: the terms nation, state, community, are words merely—they do not denote any thing separate from the individual members whose aggregation and association has received these names. The wealth, the capital of every nation, is nothing else than the aggregate of the wealth, and capital of the individuals who compose it. If individuals manage their concerns badly, the national capital suffers in proportion. Individual capital is ill managed, when managed by those who have but imperfect knowledge in the management of it. Every man who has dedicated his whole time and attention to the business by which he supports himself and his family, must have more perfect and accurate knowledge respecting the management of his capital in that business, than legislators promiscuously chosen; who have neither the same means of minute information, the same imperious motives to use them, or the same experience. Is a county-court lawyer from Pittsburg competent to direct the commercial capital and dealings of the merchants of New York, Boston, or Philadelphia? Hence, whenever legislators, comparatively ignorant of necessary details, interfere to direct the management of individual capital, they do so with inadequate knowledge; the capital will be mismanaged, and the aggregate national capital will suffer loss. Hence it is not expedient that they should interfere, in business to which they are not competent.

It is for this reason, that joint stock companies are so apt to fail, in concerns which would enrich an individual who understood and attended personally to the business. Suppose a lawyer, from Pennsylvania, should address a merchant, at New York, "my dear sir, you had better sell your ships, and build a cotton factory; it will pay you much better." Would not the merchant be entitled to say, "sir, I know how to employ my capital for my own benefit, as well as you can tell me." If the lawyer were to reply, "but I am a member of congress, and we will burthen your commerce so as to make it your interest to adopt my opinion." Would there be honesty in this compulsion? Is it not at this moment proposed to do so?

2. Proceeding on the ground of expedience. *If I can buy of my neighbour any commodity, cheaper than I*

can make it at home, I save the difference of expense by buying it; and I am more profitably employed in making some exchangeable commodity for my neighbour cheaper than he can make it, than by making the article that I want from him. As every nation is no more than [an] associated collection of individuals, what applies to each individual applies to the nation.[6] *Upon the principle of fostering home industry, every shoemaker should be his own tailor, hatter, watchmaker, joiner,*[7] *&c.* The reason why he should not be all these trades, is a reason that will apply to all individuals similarly circumstanced: that is, to the nation.

3. Again. All the argument why we should make what we want at home, rather than buy from abroad, applies to one state, refusing to deal with another state; one country, with another country; one individual, with another individual. It is in direct opposition to the plain and practical maxim,—buy where you can buy cheapest.

4. Again. Industry is put in motion by the active employment of capital; this is the great stimulus pointed out by experience. If a man have 10,000 dollars unemployed, and which he cannot afford to let lie idle, he seeks for some means of setting human industry to work, to make that capital productive. *The introduction of a new manufacture does not increase the mass of industry, if it be set on foot by means of capital already employed.*[8] Hence, whatever diminishes or increases capital, diminishes or increases the great basis of industry; and therefore industry is promoted by buying at the cheapest market wherever that be; because capital is diminished by so doing, in the smallest proportion; the aggregate capital remaining to be employed, is increased by the practice; and the quantum of national industry that is acted on by capital is also increased.

5. Again. The increased price of an article is paid by the consumer, however that increase arises. In this country more than any other, the mass of consumers are agriculturists—employed in raising raw material of every kind by cultivating the earth. *It is acknowledged every where, that agricultural capital is employed more di-*

[6] Examination, p. 5. [7] Idem, 26. [8] Idem, 29.

rectly and immediately to the advantage of the community than any other: because it is more permanent—less fluctuating in value—not easily removable—not easily affected by external wars—producing articles of the first necessity, as food, and the raw materials on which manufacture and commere are founded.[9] It produces also a healthier population than any other employment of capital; no one therefore has hitherto doubted its being the most natural, and the most valuable of all employments. But the class of consumers with us are agriculturists; it is our most advantageous employment of capital that bears the burthen of these monopolies, and is paralyzed by these operations and experiments.

6. Again. Being essentially an agricultural nation, agriculture constitutes the largest, most valuable, and most extensive interest, on which our laws can operate. This will be so for centuries to come. Indeed, centuries will pass away, before our wilds from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific, are even moderately cultivated. While this state of things, which nature has imposed on us, continues, the agricultural interest will ever be in want of capital, and furnish upon the whole the most beneficial employment of capital; even if it did no more than enable the cultivator to bring up a numerous and hardy family in health and plenty; and this it will always do. To foster every, or any other employment of capital at the expense of agriculture—by diminishing the savings of the farmer and forcing him to maintain the manufacturer—or by tempting the capitalist from agriculture into manufacture, is plainly contrary to our most undoubted policy. More obviously opposed to the interest of these United States, than of any other country on the globe. We are not aware of the magnitude of the object we are tampering with, when our experiments are made on the agricultural interests of the nation. Our population at this day is ten millions: of which almost the whole are to be supported in fact by agriculture: for whatever foreign produce or manufacture we may consume, it is in fact our agricultural produce that buys the greater part of it. Take away, however, the labour-produce of two millions and a half of people, as purchasing their supplies by the produce of mercan-

[9] Examination, p. 23.

tile or manufacturing labour. Then seven and an half millions of people are supported by agriculture. They consume, one with another, articles to the amount of 100 dollars a year; or 750 millions of dollars, independent of their surplus exported. What is our commerce, what are our manufactures, compared to the magnitude of this interest? Suppose that each of the ten millions, pay a dollar a year more than they otherwise would do, for articles of manufacture, in consequence of the prohibiting duties, and the proposed monopoly of our home manufacturers, a calculation far from extravagant; *is it a trifle to take away ten millions of dollars annually from our farmers? Yet this is the fact—this is the substance of the scheme in contemplation! For instance, in the year ending the 22d of September, 1822, we imported of foreign commodities, 83,241,544 dollars, (in round numbers 83¼ millions.) This is the importing price. The consumer paid for these at least 100 million of dollars. The proposed Tariff amounts to an additional ten per cent. at the very lowest calculation, in favour of the manufacturer; and one-tenth of an hundred is ten.*[10] What a delightful prospect for the manufacturing speculator! A douceur of ten millions of dollars a year, perpetually increasing as consumers multiply! What a magnificent operation; the product of a few clauses in a Tariff Bill! The farmers in the mean time, stare with bewildered astonishment, and are incredulous and paralyzed, from the very magnitude of the evil!

If it be said, a total prohibition of imported articles is neither desired or expected—I say, the tariff goes for the whole: what is omitted? If it do not take place instantly, the system goes to the annihilation of all importation gradually and even speedily.[11] *If it be said, the increase of home manufacture will supply the consumers plentifully and as cheaply, I say this is interested and gratuitous prophecy, falsified by the whole tenor of past fact;*[12] as I will shew presently.

7. Again. The system of prohibiting duties in this country, began with General Hamilton's administration, whose able but mistaken report on manufactures, gave origin to the experiment. This was in the year 1790.

[10] Examination, p. 15. [11] Idem, 30. [12] Idem, 27.

We have been hurried on in the tide of unsuccessful experiment ever since. *For thirty years we have steadily pursued the prohibitory system,*[13] increasing the duties of 1790, in 1798, 1800, 1804, 1812, 1816 and 1818, till that gentleman's tariff has been quintupled. Yet Mr. Baldwin declared that all attempts to support our own manufacturers have hitherto failed!!! Failed, notwithstanding the thirty years of increased encouragement, given to the monopoly, aided by a year of embargo, and eight years of war! Common sense would say, after so long, so persevering, so steady, so expensive an experiment, give it up. Mr. Baldwin and his followers say, go on; add a third to the existing duties; raise the temperature of the hot house; enact by direct or indirect means, a perpetual embargo! *All the manufacturers that have failed, have failed from the unnatural competition, and extravagant expectations, which these hot-bed experiments have given rise to. All that have succeeded, have succeeded from plain, obvious and natural causes; not by aid of prohibitory duties, but in spite of them.*[14] The duties, the embargo, the war, all operated to foster joint stock companies of speculators, who committed the management of their business to an agent, often as ignorant as themselves—buildings, extravagant and extensive, that eat up all the capital on which the manufacture was to be carried on—frequently burnt down from mere carelessness—expectations of high profits from small capitals, which no past experience here or elsewhere could justify—*want of judgment, want of skill, want of prudence, want of experience, want of attention, want of economy, and in short, want of common sense. These have been the sources of manufacturing failure shortly after the monopoly of the war.*[15] *Where manufacturers bred up to the business, understand it, personally superintend and conduct it, with a view to minute savings, moderate profits, and reasonable economy, without overtrading their capital, they have in all cases succeeded: but this class of men require the operation of a steady unfluctuating system: mark the fact; these men are not among the petitioners in favour of the Tariff.*[16]

[13] Examination, p. 34. [14] Idem, 13. [15] Idem, 35. [16] Idem, 13.

8. Again. *The experiment of endeavouring to make a manufacture stand by itself, after a series of support by the leading strings and go-carts of prohibitions, bounties, and drawbacks, has been tried in England, among others, with the silk, the glass, the linen, the sail cloth, the cordage, the hemp, the cotton, the woollen manufacture.*[17] I refer to the details in Mr. Cambreleng's excellent pamphlet. After from one to two hundred years of experiment, none of these pretend to dispense with parliamentary aid; which continues to be afforded without diminution, craving for increase after increase, even to the present day: nor will they: the tax on the consumer will probably continue till manufacturers and purchasers are no more. If that be the case in England, it will probably be so here: the gratuitous assertions, the bold and hazardous promises, and vain prophecies of the manufacturers notwithstanding. They are a class of people, however respectable, as individuals, whose promises in support of their own interest, are not to be trusted; whose statements are calculated upon the basis of their own views. *They are an associating, club-meeting, committee-forming, paragraph-writing, pamphleteering, petitioning, memorializing, urging, teazing set of men.*[18] They are known and considered so in England, from the experience of at least a century; they have shown themselves so here. Their object is monopoly; to make the farmer sell at the manufacturer's price, and buy at the manufacturer's price. *It is for the interest of the community that there should be competition among them; it is their object to exclude it.*[19] The prohibition of exporting sheep and wool in England, has taken out of the pocket of the farmer, all the profit that the woollen manufacturer has ever made. The latter has lived and grown rich, by forbidding the former to go to any market, but the home market; he has sheared the shepherd as well as the sheep. This subject might be illustrated by an historical view of the iron manufacture in this country, which has been managed excellently for the benefit of the manufacturer, but most deplorably for the community. All this may seem harsh language, to which we are not accustomed. It is high time we should be;

[17] Examination, p. 24. [18] Idem, 25. [19] Idem, 33.

for it is the literal expression of the naked truth. The manufacturers of Great Britain are there considered as a body, such as I have described them here; and they know they are so. *Has there been one meeting of farmers, throughout the United States, for the protection of agriculture against this attack, which threatens in its consequences to be so disastrous?*[20] Reflect for a moment on the consequences of a retaliating prohibitory duty on our southern staples!

9. Again. *While we have been agitating the question here, the ministry and the parliament of Great Britain, lamenting the intricacy of their restrictive and prohibitory system, declare their wish to get rid of it as soon as they can.*[21] *Lord Liverpool has expressed this opinion: a committee of the House of Commons has expressed this opinion: the merchants of London have expressed this opinion: and a committee of the manufacturers of Birmingham have published to the same effect:*[22] as they become wise, we grasp at their cast-off follies.

10. Again. A state of mutual wants, and mutual dependence, among nations, has been appointed by God Almighty in the common order of nature. Who can render himself independent of the variations of soil, of climate, of the varying habits of industry? Mutual dependence is plainly intended to compel mutual communication, and intercourse; to cherish mutual interests and good feelings; to extend mutual knowledge in arts, and sciences, and literature, and habits, and manners; to facilitate and convey all kinds of improvement; and to show practically that our mutual interest is intimately associated with mutual peace and good will. The argument in favour of insulation and independence, may be extended between two states, two counties, two townships, two men. It is a bad feeling: it induces us to wish our gains dependent on the depressions of our neighbours; whereas, it is now known that every nation is enriched by the prosperity of its customers.

11. Again. *By forcing capital into a manufacture that did not previously flourish without legislative aid, you diminish the capital of the country, without even a chance*

[20] Examination, p. 34. [21] Idem, 17. [22] Idem, 35.

of increasing its industry. Thus; there has been a great out-cry lately in England from the mischief produced by restrictive duties on the lumber and iron of Sweden and Russia. The iron manufacturers in England, and the lumber merchants of Canada, said, let us supply you: we are your own people. They succeeded; the consequence was, that all the manufactures usually sent to Sweden and Russia to buy iron and lumber, were stopt; and the home trade of the country paralyzed to the whole amount of the former exportation.[23] So if we convert among ourselves $1000, of the mercantile industry, into $1000 of manufacturing industry, we change the form, but we add nothing to the amount of this portion of the national industry. We may injure the shipping interest, the mercantile interest, the agricultural interest; but we add nothing to the parent of industry—Capital.

12. Again. Consider the manifest operation of this system, as a system.

(a.) It *paralyzes all national intercourse; we shut our doors against each other.*

(b.) It creates the hostile feeling of retaliation. I am well persuaded that to attack prohibitory duties by prohibitory duties, is always a measure adopted at the expense of the retaliating party; the latter pays for it.[24] But the feelings of revenge are too strong, and too natural to be always repressed. Have we not felt this lately?

(c.) It stops in a great measure all competition of improvement, as well as of price. When we are compelled to meet in the market, foreign goods, not only of cheap price, but of excellent quality, we endeavour to improve our own article; but, while we can compel the purchaser to buy our inferior article at our own price, by the legislative encouragements afforded to our own carelessness, where is the benefit to us of competition of workmanship? *Is there a bar of good iron, a sheet of good iron, a lb. of good steel, made in America? I have not seen it. Is there a lb. of good iron, equal even to the second brands of Sweden? I believe not. Is there a bar of iron manufactured in*

[23] Examination, p. 8. [24] Idem, 32.

America out of which good and perfect steel can be made? I have personally visited most of the forges, and all the steel furnaces of Pennsylvania, and half a dozen years ago there was no such thing.[25] Why? Look at the present Tariff on steel and iron, which enables the manufacturer here, to sell inferior qualities as fast as he can make them: and still Mr. Baldwin proposes 150 instead of 100 cents on every Cwt. of imported steel!

(d.) Those who live without buying must live without selling. *If we must not purchase the manufactures of Great Britain, the latter will not purchase our cotton, rice, or tobacco.*[26] She has nothing to do, but by means of moderate impost on our commodities, to encourage the Brazil cotton of her ancient ally, Portugal, and to permit the tobacco trade of the Crimea; and where then are the staples of Virginia and the Carolinas to be sold?

This demands more detail and developement.

Take, for instance, the Southern States. The export of rice, for the year ending 22d Sept. 1822, was valued at $ 1,555,482; of tobacco, $ 6,222,838; of cotton, $ 24,035,058; these three articles amount in round numbers to 32 millions of dollars. Can we afford to tamper with a trade of this magnitude, for the sake of a few manufacturing speculators? In half a dozen years, or ten years, Great Britain can do without these staples if she chuses; for *I assert, and appeal to men conversant with the subject, that she can supply herself in that time elsewhere: with rice from the East Indies, cotton from Brazil, and tobacco from the Crimea. She does not, because she purchases the raw material with the produce of her own warehouses; and the trade is mutually gainful.*[27] Can this be called uniformity and equality of taxation, which is thus calculated to lay desolate our Southern States—to annihilate their staple articles—and to deprive them in fact of the means of subsistence? What worse could you do by openly declaring war against the Carolinas and Georgia? I ask boldly and openly, is not this war in disguise?

Again. What kind of capital has built Boston, Salem, Providence, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Charleston, Savannah and New Orleans?

[25] Examination, p. 35. [26] Idem, 18. [27] Ibid.

Again. In the year ending Sept. 22d, 1822, there was cleared out of American ports, the amount of 813¾ thousand ton of American shipping. Dr. Seybert, in his Statistical Annals, p. 307, estimates the value in 1810 at fifty dollars per ton. *Sixty dollars is the lowest present estimate: here is a capital jeopardized by the Tariff scheme, of near fifty millions of dollars. For if our imports are to be cut off, our exports are to be cut off; no nation will trade with us on condition of buying our commodities with their gold and silver, because we refuse to take from them any thing else.*[28] What will the merchant say to this? But the ship-builder and his men, the timber merchant, the sail-maker, the hemp, cordage, bunting, the iron work, the painting, the victualling, of this immense amount of tonnage are to be jeopardized. The sailors who navigate it, also, are to seek employ elsewhere. Our freightage, our carrying trade, are to be prostrated before these speculations! These are no exaggerations: for the plan openly proposed, is, to manufacture at home, whatever you can, and to depend on yourselves entirely, for a supply of your own wants, and not on foreign nations: and for this purpose, every imported article, is to be burthened with duties so high as to encourage our people to manufacture it at home. Look at the Tariff list, and see if it be not as here stated. It is useless to exclaim against the cold-blooded destruction thus meditated; which will sweep like a pestilence over every city and town of our Atlantic States; and be deeply felt over the whole of our Western Country: for who finds out the proper market for the farmer's commodities but the merchant? Who supplies the farmer's necessities but the ever watchful industry of the merchant, whose interest it is to do so?

But it is not against the merchant and agriculturist, in those specific capacities and characters, that this monopoly system makes war, but it is against our national resources, against our revenue also. Annihilate, however gradually, your custom-house duties; and you must recur to direct taxation, or to excise. I have no time to dwell on the insuperable objections that lie against both these measures in their details—

[28] Examination, p. 30.

but, I would ask, what finance minister among us, will agree to be driven to the one of these execrated resources, or to the other? Let the manufacture-monopoly speculators succeed by hardihood of assertion, and unbounded promise, which they can give no pledge to perform, and I ask, where will you find a competent Secretary of the Treasury? I say a competent one; for I am persuaded no man of good sense will incur the difficulties, and the responsibilities of that situation, under a system of direct taxation, and an army of excise officers; unless from an extravagant love of power and appointment.

Again. *Suppose Great Britain, jealous of our commercial enterprize, and our growing naval power, and desirous of paralyzing our ocean efforts, should be able to bribe some of our influential men to get up some plan, to operate against our commerce and our navy—is it within the compass of human suggestion to devise a plan more effectual and more decisive in its operation, than this proposal to render useless the shipping of our country, and to prostrate the mercantile interest? Can any measure be devised more certain to sell us soul and body to the naval powers of Europe, than the plan now offered to Congress?*[29]

13. I proceed to other objections against the expediency of a proposed Tariff. I say then it is impossible to be executed. *It is not practicable to guard the extent of smuggling coast from Passamaquoddy to Georgia, and from the St. Lawrence to Lake Erie.*[30] During the embargo, $70,000 worth of produce was smuggled over to Kingston, from the petty port of the falls of Genessee. During the last war, British goods were regularly insured into New York at 6 per cent.

14. Again. Suppose you could, by an army of revenue officers, prohibit smuggling, would it be desirable to give the appointment of such an army to the President of the United States? That officer has more power and patronage already, than he ought to have; and no friend to his country would wish to see it increased.

[29] Examination, p. 31. [30] Idem, 33.

15. Again. All smuggling introduces habits of disregard to moral principle. Revenue laws tempt to this. But where the law passed, amounts to a war against the rights of a particular class of the community, it will assuredly be opposed or evaded. *Smuggling, in opposition to the proposed Tariff, will be accounted no crime; and it will effect its purpose of opposition in a way that every friend of his country must deplore.*[31] For *obedience to law is the first duty of a citizen; but it will never be paid to an unjust law.*[32] Have we lost our recollection of the facts of the last war? Or of the illicit trade at our north-eastern boundary?

For the oppressive nature of Mr. Baldwin's proposals on the poor of the country—the aristocratic character of his propositions—and the details of fact necessary to be attended to in this discussion, I refer to the very able pamphlet of Mr. Cambreleng of New York,[33] which no man can peruse carefully, without being satisfied of the mischievous tendency of this proposed Tariff. Most of the preceding arguments will be found in Adam Smith, Say, Marcet and Craig; in the memorial of the merchants of Charleston; and in a late number of the North American Review, for July 1823; to all which, for further information, I refer the reader. But, I hope the preceding pages contain reasons sufficient in number and in force, to point out the abyss in which we are about to be plunged.

I come now to the pretensions on which Mr. Baldwin's Tariff is founded.

To render us independent of foreign nations.

To keep our gold and silver at home.

To prevent a ruinous balance of trade against us.

To foster our national industry.

To take advantage of machinery.

To protect establishments now in existence.

To provide a home market for the farmer's products.

To employ our idle population.

To render us independent of foreign nations.—This is not possible; because there are products peculiar to

[31] Examination, p. 33. [32] Idem, 27. [33] Idem, 26.

every nation, which an advanced state of civilization renders it desirable to obtain. Is not Great Britain dependent on other nations for her wine, oil, rice, silk, cotton, tobacco, madder, indigo, &c. &c. &c.? Are we more dependent on her, than she is on us? Or, can any nation be said to be dependent, who has wherewithal to purchase what she wants? Nor is it desirable; for the mutual dependence of nations on each other, keeps up that peaceful and beneficial intercourse, by which civilization is in every way promoted, and human comforts increased. *I do not believe that we need manufacture at home, even our fire-arms or our gunpowder; for on six months notice, we can always provide a sufficient stock of these implements; and no war ever comes on so suddenly as to prevent us.*[34]

To keep our gold and silver at home.—*We do not want it at home. We want it for two purposes only; for small market money; and to answer the occasional calls that are made to check imprudent bank-issues.*[35] Gold and silver are not wealth, but the factitious and conventional exponents and representatives of wealth. What specie we possess, we bought with a more valuable commodity, or we could not have had these metals at all. In the same way, we can buy again what we want of them. We sell other commodities, to the more abundant possessors of gold and silver, who are glad to exchange with us, the latter for the former.

When we export gold and silver, we do not export wealth peculiarly; we export only the representatives of those products of our national industry, which we gave for them. *When gold and silver are scarce among us, the nations who possess these metals in greater plenty, are glad to sell them at the increased price, occasioned by the increased demand; so that in a short time the supply and the demand, in this, as in every other commodity, are sure to equalize themselves. We send our home products to the market where specie is for sale.*[36] Is it necessary to labour a point so plain as this? And yet the defenders of the Tariff, seem to know nothing about it!

[34] Examination, p. 21. [35] Idem, 27. [36] Idem, 6.

To prevent a ruinous balance of trade against us. *If by balance of trade, be meant buying more than you pay for, this can never be a permanent evil. Those who give you credit, will stop that credit very speedily, if they find you do not merit it, by paying your debts with reasonable punctuality. Merchants are too sharp-sighted to continue supplying a customer who does not pay them. We may safely assert that this is an evil which will surely cure itself.*[37]

If it be meant, that the misfortune exists in being compelled to pay the balance against us in specie, it amounts to nothing, for specie is only another name for the commodities we give for it.[38] Specie is not wealth, but the representative of the wealth that bought it. If we can get more by sending specie in payment, than by sending produce, it is worth our while to send specie: if not, we send produce. If we cannot send produce with profit, where we owe the debt, we send it elsewhere, and buy specie with it, and then transfer the specie, by bills of exchange, to the place where it is wanted. This is the common course of trade.

It is absolutely necessary to the prosperity of a nation, that the custom-house entries should exhibit a balance of import beyond export.[39]

A merchant embarks 70,000 dollars in a voyage, and he expects, say 15 per cent. profit. He buys or builds a vessel of 300 ton: the outfit of the vessel costs him 60 dollars per ton, advance wages, insurance, and other items, bring it up to 20,000 dollars. He puts on board 50,000 dollars, of the produce of this country. The custom-house entries show no more than this 50,000 dollars: but his capital is 70,000, and that is to net him 15 per cent. which, on 70,000 dollars, is 10,000 dollars. If therefore, he does not bring back 60,000 dollars worth of foreign goods, he makes a bad voyage. The capital engaged in freight, therefore, and which never appears on the custom-house books, must bring its profit like every other capital. *What was the American freightage of last year?* 813,748 *tons; which, at* 60 *dollars per ton, amounts to* 48,824,880 *dollars.*[40] Here is an amount of capital employed in the American trade, and producing its regular

[37] Examination, p. 5. [38] Idem, 27. [39] Ibid. [40] Idem, 30.

profit, which forms no article of export, on the custom-house entries. This ought of itself to bring $7\frac{1}{3}$ million of dollars profit, all which contributes to swell the excess of import, against export. These clear-sighted defenders of the tariff, however, set down this profit against us, as dead loss: to be paid up in specie! Moreover, upon every exported cargo entered at the custom-house, as worth 100 dollars, the merchant ought to get a profit (an ample one I admit) of 15 per cent. Hence the return cargo, ought to be entered at 115 dollars. There, say these gentlemen, you see how it is! you are galloping along the high road to ruin! you have bought 15 per cent. more than you have sold! you must pay this balance in specie! What will these gentlemen say to imports purchased by bills of exchange? What will these gentlemen say to the return cargoes of whalers, sealers, and Pacific Ocean traders? The merchant calls the result gain; *the Tariff gentlemen, weep over it as loss; and predict ruin to the nation, from this dreadful excess of imports, which has hitherto enriched all concerned.*[41] Dreadful it is, that reasoning such as theirs, should gain a convert at this day in the Congress of the United States! I consider as a national misfortune, and a national disgrace, that we should waste day after day, in wrangling opposition to the very axioms of a well-known science, and to facts familiar to every merchant's clerk.

To foster our national industry.—*It requires no fostering. If there be full employment for capital, you have all you can have.*[42] Does not capital bring always 5, generally 6 & 7 per cent. among us? Is not this rate of interest, an exponent that our capital is not too plentiful? In Holland money can be had at 3, in England at this moment at 4 per cent.

It is capital that puts in motion, that fosters industry. *If your capital be fully employed, your industry is at its speed. If commerce and manufacture yield the same interest, they equally foster national industry, which is not promoted but retarded by forcing a capital employed in the one, into the other.*[43] For it takes time to do this: and hazard of loss is incurred in

[41] Examination, p. 28. [42] Idem, 29. [43] Idem, 14.

doing it. All forced results, are comparatively bad, when compared to those which follow the usual and natural course of things.

To take advantage of machinery.—*If capital, employed in commerce, bring 15 per cent. and capital, employed in machinery, bring 15 per cent. there is nothing gained by converting the one into the other.*[44]

Oh, but a cotton mill will perform the work of a thousand hands—Will it so? What then, if it brings me no higher than common profit? But it will bring much greater profit—Will it so? Then *so many people will have cotton mills, that in a year or two, the profit will decrease to the common level,*[45] and I shall be no gainer.

The machinery of England, is, in many instances, a dreadful curse to that country; and the British manufacturing system would be so to this. The works usually go night and day, one set of boys and girls go to bed, as another set get up to work. The health, the manners, the morals, are all corrupted. They work not for themselves, but for the capitalist who employs them: they are employed on the calculation of how small a sum will subsist a human creature: they are machines, as much so as the spindles they superintend: hence they are not calculated to turn readily, from one occupation to another: they are the most discontented, the most ignorant, the most turbulent of the British population. The whole system tends to increase the wealth of a few capitalists, at the expense of the health, life, morals, and happiness, of the wretches who labour for them. I would rather see treatises on the sources of national happiness, than national wealth. We want in this happy country, no increase of proud and wealthy capitalists, whose fortunes have accumulated by such means. It is not the careful, skilful superintendant of his own business, living frugally, but plentifully on reasonable profits, who expresses discontent at the present state of things—no, it is the would-be great man, anxious to acquire wealth speedily, by means of an extorted monopoly, who is most forward in petitioning for an increase of prohibitory duties. *Neither the prophecies, the pro-*

[44] Examination, p. 14. [45] Idem, 24.

mises, or the statements of these men, are to be trusted.[45] *They may pledge themselves to any thing, for they know they cannot be called on to redeem it. They calculate the imposition will last their time.*[47] Well meaning and good men have been over persuaded by the bold assertions of those who are interested; and we stand now actually on the very brink of the precipice to which they have urged us. It is impossible to shut our eyes to the wonderful superiority in permanence of capital invested in agriculture, over capital invested in machinery. For instance, the silk trade of England would have been prostrated by the cotton trade, if Parliament had not taxed the people to keep it alive. I remember when it was dangerous to walk the streets with any but a metal button to your coat, the button trade being in jeopardy from covered buttons. I remember petition upon petition to the Prince of Wales, to beg his highness would wear buckles to his shoes. *It is an axiom, founded on universal experience, that monopolists will forever continue to require monopoly.*[48] The question between the sugar planters of the West Indies and the East Indies, now in agitation, is a most useful lesson.

To protect establishments now in existence.—*There are many manufacturing establishments now in existence, which require no further aid or protection. Nothing of the kind is necessary, where common skill, industry, prudence, and frugality are employed. I know, from personal inquiry and observation, of so many cotton, woollen, and other establishments, whose prudent owners were acquiring fortunes by their industry, at the very height of Mr. Baldwin's lamentations, that no possible doubt can exist with me of the competence of the present system to afford all the protection that industry requires.*[49] Extravagance, unskilfulness, carelessness, high profits, and over-trading, will urge with all kind of importunity the necessity of further protection; but ought they to be listened to? It is worth while for gentlemen to inquire, whether all this out-cry has not arisen from the selfish views of a very few men, who wish to sell out unprofitable establishments, or who have large unsaleable stocks

[46] Examination, p. 25. [47] Ibid. [48] Idem, 33. [49] Idem, 22.

on hand, which the proposed monopoly law would give value to? Whether the newspaper essays, the pamphlets, and statements are not the manufacture of one and the same industrious individual, and represent his opinions only? Whether much of the aid he has received out of doors, has not arisen from that spirit of intermeddling, and that lust of popularity, which such a question seemed well calculated to gratify? And whether, under these circumstances, the public voice ought to be identified with this interested clamour?

I say out of doors: because, it is with great reluctance, I can bring myself to believe, that any man in Congress, can so far prostitute his talents as to advocate a measure, for the sake of popularity with his immediate constituents, which is hostile to the interest of the nation at large. The man who does so, if such a man there be, is an unworthy citizen. Every man called to the national representation, is a national, not a local representative. He is sent to debate, and after debate to decide upon the great interests of the nation. Of what use is a deliberative assembly, with power to send for persons and papers, and to ascertain facts on the highest responsible authority, if a member may decide without, or in the face of them? The constitution of a representative assembly, implies that mutual deliberation and discussion must precede the vote. A member from another state, has a right to say to an instructed member, "Sir, we are entitled here to the benefit of your advice and opinion, founded upon the discussions that take place here. Your constituents do not know what passes here; we have no opportunity of communicating with them; our arguments cannot reach them; the facts we have called up before us they are unacquainted with; they are, therefore, not competent, constitutionally, or in any other way to decide. They have no right to decide upon partial deliberation, or imperfect information; in appointing you, they have given up that right; nor can you be bound by such a decision. Moreover, you belong to us, not to them: you are sent here to the national council, to deliberate for the nation, and not for the petty district where you reside. If you are allowed, at any time, to advocate their immediate

interests, it is upon the presumption, that they are coincident with the national interests, and that you are likely to possess more accurate local knowledge than the rest of us. If they have taken up ill-founded opinions or prejudices, from partial views of the subject, it is your duty, not to foster, but correct them."

If existing establishments are to be protected because much money has been invested in them, then no improvement, which will supersede them, can ever be introduced. On this principle, the cotton-mill, the steam-engine, the cotton-gin, the rice-machinery, the nail-cutting machine, the wool-card machine, and a thousand others, must have been prohibited, because great sums had already been invested in existing establishments. Surely, in the competition of talent and ingenuity, every man takes his chance of the profitable nature of the improvement he introduces. Is it my fault or yours, that an inconsiderate manufacturer has invested his whole property in machinery far inferior to that which we propose to employ?

Another pretence is, to provide a home market for farming produce.—Will a manufacturer eat more than a farmer? Will his machinery consume corn and cattle and flour?[50] It is true, if you convert half a dozen farmers into half a dozen manufacturers, you will not increase the number of mouths, but you will decrease the number of producers of food. Is it desirable to convert half a dozen farmers into half a dozen manufacturers, for the sake of enabling the farmer to buy an inferior home manufacture, dearer than a better foreign article of the same kind? *Lay no prohibitory duty, and the consumer has two choices, the manufacturer at home, and the manufacturer abroad; impose these duties, and he must buy and sell too, at the pleasure of the home monopolist. So far from making the farmer independent, as is pretended, it renders him the slave of the monopolist at home. Moreover, if he be prevented from selling his grain to foreigners, and purchasing in return foreign produce, he is left at the mercy of the home monopolist, both in buying and selling.*[51] In fact, what-

[50] Examination, p. 25. [51] Idem, 24.

ever the farmer buys, he buys with the produce of his farm, whether he buys of the foreign manufacturer or the home manufacturer: he has nothing wherewithal to pay, but the produce of his farm; in either case he has a market; but the difference is, *the Tariff will make him give four bushels of corn for an article, that heretofore cost him three.*[52]

If it be said, there is no adequate demand for farming produce, I deny that has been the case in this country, so often or to such a degree as in every part of Europe. *Fluctuations there will be in every market; we have had few in this country to complain of; and those but of very short duration, and dependent on circumstances, over which legislation has no control.*[53] It is the business of the merchant, whose occupation is to be annihilated by the Tariff, to find a market for the farmer's crop; he is the fly-wheel of the machine, equalizing the demand and supply; and hitherto he has done it well. *In the most depressed state of the agricultural market, the farmer revels at least in peace and superabundance:*[54] in the same state of the manufacturing market, the manufacturer starves.

To employ our idle population.—If there be any part of the population who suffer from want of employment, it can only be by accident, and for a short time: it never has been, and in such a country as this, never can be a general source of complaint. Look at the back country of the Atlantic States, or the whole Western country, and when and where among them, has this complaint been made? If there be so much idle population in New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore, how comes it that there is such demand for negro domestic servants? Should this asserted evil become extensive and permanent, it will suggest the erection of manufactures to use up this surplus population: but you cannot force an idler to work, who chuses to beg, or to starve, or to steal: and whom you tempt to become an idler by your poor laws. But the whole is a pretence. Sometimes the argument is, the price of labour is so high in America, that we cannot manufacture here without protecting duties. What, then, becomes of our overflowing population, seeking

[52] Examination, p. 24. [53] Idem, 34. [54] Idem, 22.

for work and finding none? Sometimes, our population is so scanty, compared to the demand for it, that we must work by machinery—what, then, becomes of this idle population so much talked of? In fact, whenever a sudden stimulus to trade increases the demand for hands, the supply more or less, quickly follows the demand: when the stimulus ceases, the demand ceases, and an over population is the temporary consequence. This was the case all over Europe and in this country, for a couple of years after the peace; and continues till the surplus population is gradually absorbed. No legislation can prevent or cure this.

This is the third attempt, I have made to call the attention of the public to this very serious question. I published an essay to the same purpose with the present, in the Analectic Magazine, for July 1819, p. 39, and again in the National Intelligencer, Jan. 1822, under the signature of 'Terra.' I return to the subject for the third and last time; under a full conviction that its probable consequences are not enough reflected on. I care little, comparatively, whether the 500,000 people who inhabit South Carolina, shall be taxed a dollar, per head, per annum, in favour of the Northern speculators in manufacture. This of itself is a tolerable specimen of head-work at our expense. But the Southern States, live by their staple commodities of Tobacco, Rice and Cotton: principally the latter. We have no reason to fear East Indian competition. We have reason to fear the competition of Brazil. Except during the two last years of disorganized government in that fine country, the Brazilian Cotton has been gaining annually upon our own in the Liverpool market, notwithstanding an export duty on the article at Brazil. In the present state of things, we want no protecting duties: but remember, it is not much more than a twelve month ago, since the United States adopted a system of retaliating duties against Great Britain. Is there no danger of Great Britain adopting a system of retaliation against us?*

* On July 4th, 1823, the reciprocating Duty Bill, was carried in the House of Commons, 75 to 15.

Is it not in her power gradually to foster Brazilian competition, if we make it her interest to do so—if we excite and provoke her to do so—if we exclude the articles with which she is accustomed to pay for the Cotton we send her?†

Let the Southern States look to it. They are not threatened with a system of unjust and burthensome taxation merely: this is a trifle in the plan. They are threatened with an annihilation of their staple commodity—not with taxation, but destruction.

† Import of Brazil Cotton into Great Britain—for the year 1802, 74,720 bales of 210 lbs. each: for 1810, 142,840 bales: for 1820, 180,086 bales.

THE END.